THE

ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

Vol. LXVIII.

BOSTON
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
1906

Advocate of Peace.

VOL. LXVIII. BOSTON, JANUARY, 1906. No. 1

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
PUBLISHERS,
31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

MONTHLY, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR. TEN CENTS PER COPY

Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Matter.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDITORIALS	1-5
The Coming Hague Conference — The Nobel Peace Prize for 1905 — Garrison as a Peace Man — The President's Lecture on the Hague Conference.	
EDITORIAL NOTES	5-9
More Moderate Naval Program — New British Ministry—Russia Understanding Germany—Pennsylvania Peace Society—A Military Prize Essayist — Proposed Hague Day — W. C. T. U. Peace Work — Race Hatred — Prominent Advocates of Peace Gone.	
BREVITIES	9-10
GENERAL ARTICLES:	
Our Comrade, Christ. *Poem. Edwin Arnold Brenholtz*	10
The Ballad of the Boundary Line. *Poem. H. Lavinia Baily*	10
The Hague Conference. *From the President's Message*	11-12
The Peace Movement and Germany. *Dr. Ernst Richard*	12-16
What the Wise Men Did and What the Wise Men Ought to Do. *Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D. D., LL. D.*	16 17
Inciting to War. *Edwin Arnold Brenholtz*	17-19
Calls to Christian Service. *Raymond L. Bridgman*	19-20
NEW BOOKS	21

The Coming Hague Conference.

It is reported from Washington that the President has decided to appoint Hon. Joseph H. Choate, ex-Ambassador to Great Britain, as Chairman of the United States delegation to the coming Hague Conference. The names of the other members of the delegation have not yet been given out. The President is reported to be giving much consideration to the selection, that those sent may be strong and capable men. Mr. Choate will make an able and practical chairman. If Andrew D. White's age and health would permit him to go again, we should all expect him to be chosen as the fittest man in the nation to head the delegation. But since this cannot be, the choice could not have fallen upon a better representative than Mr. Choate. He is one of the ablest lawyers in the country, has served us with distinguished ability at the Court of St. James, and is by nature and habit of thought thoroughly in sympathy with the great purposes of the peace movement. While in London he always used his influence towards a true and abiding friendship between that country and this, and would have done the same at the court of any other government to which he might have been sent.

The date of the meeting of the Conference has, so far as we know, not yet been announced. We doubt if it has been fixed. The condition of affairs in Russia has made it most difficult for the Czar, to whom the assembling of the Conference has fallen, to make any serious preparation for it. It may on this account be delayed several months, though the general expectation is that it will meet sometime during the coming summer or autumn.

The interest felt in the Conference is extraordinarily widespread and strong, and great things are expected of it when it does meet. Not all that the most advanced friends of peace would like to see done will be accomplished by it, but there is every reason to believe that it will make a most momentous contribution to the work of the permanent organization and establishment of peaceful relations among the nations.

The subjects most talked of for the program of the Conference are, as our readers already know: (1) the protection of the rights of neutrals at sea in time of war; (2) provision for the codification of international law; (3) arrest and reduction of armaments; (4) the extension of the principle of neutralization to other states and waterways, including the great trade routes on the ocean; (5) the conclusion of a permanent general treaty of obligatory arbitration stipulating reference of disputes to the Hague Court; and (6) the establishment of an international assembly to meet periodically to deliberate on questions of general interest to the nations. Certain other matters are also proposed for discussion, but the above are the capital themes about which the interest of the Conference will centre, and make its deliberations and conclusions memorable in the history of the world.

The subject of greatest moment will be that of the creation of a regular International Congress, though arrest and reduction of armaments and a permanent general treaty of obligatory arbitration will be in the very front of the discussions. The Special Committee of the Interparliamentary Union, to whose meeting in Paris we referred last month, decided, as we stated, not to recommend the creation of an international legislature, as at the present time premature. But they did decide to recommend that the Hague Conference itself should be constituted by the governments into a permanent body which shall meet automatically and periodically. This is what we have for some time believed and suggested to be the most practicable course to take to reach the end desired, and now this great international body of statesmen has taken the thought up and will throw the weight

of its powerful influence in favor of it at The Hague. That will almost certainly assure its adoption.

This special Committee went further at Paris and decided to propose at The Hague that the Interparliamentary Union be reorganized so as to constitute a parliamentary official adjunct to the Hague Conference as a regular body, or a Lower House, representing the people through the parliaments as the other body will represent the governments. As this would make the scheme much more complex and difficult to bring into working order at the present time, we doubt very much if the Hague Conference can be induced to recommend it. But if the first part of the plan, which is perfectly simple and feasible, shall be adopted, the step of fate will have been taken, and that permanent and complete organization of the nations which is now demanded by so many of the larger interests of humanity will have taken another step even more momentous than that of setting up the Hague Tribunal. All the rest will follow in its time, and its time will not be far away.

The Nobel Peace Prize for 1905.

The Nobel Peace Prize for 1905 was awarded, on the 10th of December, to the Baroness Bertha von Suttner of Vienna, Austria. The ceremony took place in the new building of the Nobel Institute in Christiania, which was only recently completed and opened as the permanent headquarters of the work of the Committee of the Norwegian parliament, which has in charge the administration of the peace prize fund. The occasion was rendered the more noteworthy by the presence of the new king of Norway, Haakon, and Queen Maud, together with all the ministers of state, the members of the parliament and of the diplomatic corps.

The Baroness well deserves the recognition that has thus been given to her long-continued, self-sacrificing and eminently efficient services in the cause of peace. Though possessed of but small means, she has carried on for fifteen or sixteen years, her husband heartily coöperating with her as long as he lived, an incessant campaign through the European press, public lectures and private interviews in behalf of the noble ideas to which she has consecrated her talents and her high position. She has been a prominent figure in the Peace Congresses since 1891. She had large influence at The Hague during the Czar's Peace Conference in 1899. Her great story, "Lay Down Your Arms" (Die Waffen Nieder), has had an immense circulation, having gone through some thirty editions in German and a large number in the translations which have been made of it into foreign languages. A number of other books from her pen — "Schach der Qual," "The Peace Conference at The Hague," etc.— have also supported and extended the fine humanitarian principles which lay at the foundation of her famous story.

The Baroness has been singularly fortunate in escaping criticism. Her zeal and courage in advocating the cause of peace have always been marked with good judgment and tact. Her public work has not lessened in the least her remarkable womanly reserve and delicacy of manner. Nor has her position in the nobility, which has given her unusual influence in the higher political circles of Europe, closed her way to effective labor among the common people wherever she has met and spoken to them; for she is thoroughly democratic in her conceptions and feelings, showing always the deepest sympathies with the people in their struggles and sufferings.

Her many friends in all countries are heartily glad that the Nobel Committee have seen their way this year to award her this great prize of nearly forty thousand dollars. Some of them have been surprised that the recognition has not come earlier, especially in view of the fact that it was through her influence with Mr. Nobel, in an interview at Paris some time before he died, that he was induced to devote a part of his immense fortune to the advancement of the cause of international peace.

The circumstances attending the annual bestowing of this prize bear testimony to the extraordinary progress which the peace cause has made in recent years, and the powerful hold which it now has upon the civilized world. We have alluded above to the presence of the King of Norway, the parliament, the state ministers and the foreign ministers at the ceremonies on the 10th ult. in the Nobel Institute. That in itself was highly significant. But it is still more remarkable that the civilized world takes such an extraordinary interest in the awarding of this prize. Four other Nobel prizes of the same amount are conferred at the same time each year by a Committee of the Swedish parliament, but if one may judge from the amount of space devoted to them in the press, the peace prize attracts more attention and awakens deeper interest than all the others combined. The other prizes deal with great sections of human knowledge and interest — physics and chemistry, literature, history, physiology and medicine; but the peace prize has to do with the most fundamental and universal interests of humanity in all countries, and in all its ranks and classes, and this accounts largely for the wider interest which it awakens. Whoever proves to be worthy to receive this prize is, in the present condition of the nations, armed to the breaking point and weighted down by the burdens of militarism, rightly considered a benefactor of all men everywhere.

One word more. The Nobel Peace Prize Committee, now organized as the Nobel Institute, with its excellent new building constructed at a cost of $70,000, is destined to be hereafter one of the most

conspicuous and influential centres of the peace propaganda. The building contains administration rooms, committee rooms, a hall for public lectures, and fine library rooms, in which has already been placed the excellent and rapidly growing collection of books dealing with international questions.

Garrison as a Peace Man.

William Lloyd Garrison, the one hundredth anniversary of whose birth was celebrated last month, was a many-sided man as a reformer. But the circumstances of the times caused him to be so fully occupied with the anti-slavery movement that he is not usually thought of in other connections. But he was as radical in his views on peace, temperance, free trade, woman's rights, Chinese exclusion, etc., as on slavery. Under other conditions he might have become a powerful leader in any one of these movements.

The root out of which his opinions on all these subjects grew was the same, namely, his feeling of the worth of human beings as such. It is doubtful if any man of any time ever had a profounder sense of the inherent value of men. He saw also with great clearness the bearings of this conception on all the social and political relations of society. A few of his own utterances reveal the depth and breadth of his thought in this regard: "My country is the world; my countrymen are all mankind." This was the motto which he put and kept at the head of all his work. Again: "I claim to be a human rights man; and wherever there is a human being, I see God-given rights inherent in that being, whatever may be the sex or complexion." "I go for the people, — the whole people, — whatever be their bodily dimensions, temporal conditions or shades of color." He was led, therefore, inevitably by the logic of his principles to take a deep interest in every movement for the promotion of justice, human rights, human liberties and opportunities, and for the removal and destruction of every practice and system which injures and degrades men.

He very early became convinced that war and the spirit creating and controlling it constitute one of the deepest and direst evils and crimes which afflict and mar humanity. He at once took the most radical grounds in opposition to the whole system. He became a "non-resistant," entirely renouncing violence not only as a means of securing justice and right but even of defending oneself against assault. In 1833, in a declaration drawn up for the Anti-Slavery Society, he said: "Our principles forbid the doing of evil that good may come, and lead us to reject, and to entreat the oppressed to reject, the use of all carnal weapons for deliverance from bondage." Again he wrote: "We register our testimony not only against all wars, whether offensive or defensive, but all preparations for war — against every naval ship, every arsenal, every fortification; against the militia system and a standing army; against all military chieftains and soldiers; against all monuments commemorative of victory over a fallen foe, all trophies won in battle, all celebrations in honor of military or naval exploits, etc."

In 1838 a convention was called in Boston to consider non-resistance as a basis of peace. It was attended by one hundred and fifty persons. Garrison led in the deliberations, and drew up a long document, which the convention adopted, in which the non-resistant views were expounded in their fullest scope. The Non-Resistance Society, founded by the Convention, continued for several years, and issued a semi-monthly paper, which was edited by Edmund Quincy. Garrison considered this "a still greater cause" than the anti-slavery movement.

So consistent did Garrison endeavor to be in adherence to his principles that he refused to have anything to do with whatever seemed to him to excuse or in any way uphold war — holding office, voting, occupying a seat in a legislative assembly, or on the bench. He likewise declined to coöperate with the peace societies which were not founded upon the non-resistance principle, but admitted into their membership all persons who believed war to be a dire evil and scourge, and desired to help abolish it, even though they believed it still sometimes inevitable and justifiable. In this particular he went to greater extremes than many other non-resistant peace men, like John Bright, for example, who were just as loyal to their principles as he, but who did not believe some of Garrison's methods either imperative or the wisest and most effective for accomplishing the results sought by all of them, namely, the extinction of war.

Garrison has often been criticised for taking these extreme practical positions. But we think the criticism hardly just. Constituted as he was and feeling deeply as he did, he could scarcely have done otherwise and remained a conscientious and forceful man. Every man must do his work in his own way, according to his own genius and the insight which he is able to attain. This Garrison evidently did.

Garrison has been declared to have abandoned his peace principles when the Civil War came on. The Encyclopedia Britannica makes this assertion. But this seems to us a very superficial view, and radically untrue. It was a very trying situation in which he found himself, but he never faltered in his personal adherence to his non-resistance principles, as Whittier never did. He remained an unarmed man, disapproving of resort to violence, relying for himself solely on moral forces, in whose irresistibility he firmly believed, if men could only be brought vigorously to maintain them. When the war was actually on, he sympathized with every success of the North, because he saw in it a hope of the overthrow of the abomination of slavery.

The men who believed in the right and duty of employing carnal weapons were conducting the conflict on a different plane from his, but he thanked God that they were "so far advanced that they would take those weapons out of the scale of despotism and throw them into the scale of freedom. It was an indication of progress and a positive moral growth; it was one way to get up to the sublime platform of non-resistance."

What Garrison and those of his peace principles are to be most criticised for, if for anything, is that they did not find and advocate a generous practical method of the abolition of slavery in a way perfectly in harmony with their peace ideas. He ought to have known instinctively that Horace Greeley's plan of "letting the erring sisters go," however wise it might have been as compared with the awful tragedy of war, would not be tolerated. On the other hand, the success of the anti-slavery men in England in 1833 ought to have led him to the early advocacy of the policy of purchasing the freedom of the slaves. If this policy had been urged from the beginning of his work, there is little doubt that in the twenty-five years following the whole nation, South and North, could have been brought to accept it, and slavery have been ended without the shedding of a drop of blood and at much less cost than that imposed by the war.

Garrison's service to the cause of peace was, on the whole, a great one, and the world is sure in time to come round to his main views, as it has done in regard to slavery.

The President's Lecture on the Hague Conference.

We give in full on another page that portion of President Roosevelt's recent message to Congress which is contained under the caption, "The Hague Conference." The more we study this section of the message the more we are puzzled to comprehend it. If we did not know that the author of all parts of it were the same man, we should be forced to apply to it the method of the Higher Criticism and say that the third, fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs, and certain sentences and phrases in the following ones, are "by a different hand."

What the President says on the proposed new Hague Conference is in general most admirable. He recites the history of his issuance, on the suggestion of the Interparliamentary Union, of invitations to the powers to send delegates to such a conference, of their ready acceptance, and of the Czar of Russia taking the initiative, after the treaty of peace was signed at Portsmouth, in recommending that the Conference be called. He says that the United States government will do everything in its power to secure the success of the Conference, "that substantial progress may be made in the cause of international peace, justice and goodwill." Further on in the passage he says that it is "our clear duty to strive in every practicable way to bring nearer the time when the sword shall not be the arbiter among nations." He urges "that this nation do all in its power to try to further the movement and to make the result of the decisions of the Hague Conference effective." He declares that arbitration should be made the customary way of settling international disputes, in most cases, and that a general arbitration treaty should be concluded among all the nations that will be represented at the Conference. He favors the conclusion of an international agreement defining contraband of war and providing protection for neutral rights and property at sea in time of war. He even goes so far as to approve, in a mild way, of the movement, now under such vigorous way, for the creation of "something like an organization of the civilized nations," a regular international congress, that is; and though he thinks the time not ripe for immediate disarmament, he conceives it to be "possible to exercise some check upon the tendency to swell indefinitely the budgets for military expenditure." He has "a real and great desire that this second Hague Conference may mark a long stride forward in the direction of securing the peace of justice throughout the world," that "a surer method than now exists of securing justice as between nations" may be established, and that "the Golden Rule should be . . . the guiding rule of conduct among nations as among individuals."

Why could not the President have stopped here? This was substantially what ought to have been said. It was timely and constructive, and in general it was lofty in spirit and statesmanlike. It would have appealed powerfully to the world. There was not the least occasion, so far as we can see, for his making his Message an excuse for rapping peace workers over the head and reading them a humiliating lecture on their supposed "folly," their "sentimentalism," "demagoguery," and "hysterical pseudo-philanthropy." Nobody misunderstood the "general attitude" of the government toward peace. Nobody was hysterically asking impossibilities, even where it was ventured to suggest more than the President himself thought to be practicable at present. Those of whom he uses these hard names love justice as intensely as he does, and for that reason they hate war. They know as well as he that peace is normally the handmaid of justice, but they know also, as he does not seem to know, that injustice and unrighteousness and shame and dishonor are normally the handmaids of war, and that so is a whole troop of other iniquities of which he never speaks and of which he seems to have no just appreciation.

The President claims that there could be no greater calamity than for the free peoples, the enlightened, peace-loving peoples, to disarm, while leaving it open to "any barbarism or despotism to remain armed."

Has he asked himself seriously what "barbarisms" would anywhere remain to be a danger, if the more than forty powers that have been considered enlightened enough to be invited to the second Hague Conference should come to an agreement to dispense with three-fourths or nine-tenths of their armies and navies? Or, if even the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Russia and Japan should do so, what little remaining "barbarism" would be able to force a "shameful peace" upon them? The friends of peace have uniformly advocated *simultaneous* and not separate disarmament by the nations. Is Mr. Roosevelt opposed to this?

Two questions have been raised within us by the reading of this curious portion of the Hague section of the Message. Has the President gone so far as a champion of peace principles and methods that he has become alarmed lest those who remember his oft repeated praises of war as an instrument of righteousness, justice and manliness, may rise up and charge him with shameful inconsistency? And has he sought to save his face by going out of his way to reiterate and emphasize his old views? Or has the peace movement, in its enormous recent development and sweep, become so powerful that he has grown anxious lest it become too great and overmastering, and has he thrown himself into the breach to save the world from what he conceives would be so great a moral calamity?

It is difficult to find any satisfactory *motif* for these declarations of the President. The most regrettable thing about it all is that it will weaken confidence in his peace professions and lessen his power to further promote the cause. Those who have believed (as we have not believed) these professions to be largely pretences for the sake of expediency — and they are not inconsiderable in number — will be more deeply inclined than ever to believe that Mr. Roosevelt is essentially a man of war, that it is rooted in him, that he loves it, that he "speaks of his own" when he talks of it as in this Message, and that any peace hopes built upon him will prove to be broken reeds. We sincerely wish that he had kept these utterances to himself, so uncalled for were they, and so out of harmony with the noble and valuable declarations to which they are attached. The time has passed for any one who stands forward as a friend and promoter of humanity and better international relations to push to the front passionate arguments in favor of war as if it were a divine and still necessary institution.

Index and Title Page.

Any of the subscribers to the ADVOCATE OF PEACE who keep files of the paper for binding can obtain the Index and Title Page to Volume LXVII., the volume for 1905, by sending request to the office of the American Peace Society. Enclose a one cent stamp to cover postage.

Editorial Notes.

More Moderate Naval Program.

It is gratifying to see that the policy of adding every year new ships to the navy is to stop, for the present at least. In his recent Message to Congress, President Roosevelt said: "Our navy, though very small relatively to the navies of other nations, is for the present sufficient in point of numbers for our needs, and while we must constantly strive to make its efficiency higher, there need be no additions to the total number of ships now built and building, save in the way of substitution (new and efficient vessels for the old ones)." This is a very different note in the President's utterances from what we have grown accustomed to in previous years. It is a very encouraging change, provided it means anything more than a temporary halt in new constructions until the numerous ships of various classes now building are completed. What has induced the President to modify his views so much? It is probable that the new Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Bonaparte, has had considerable to do with it. The Secretary, in his annual report, has taken strong ground against further increase either in the number of vessels or the size of the battleships, in exact opposition to the recommendations of his predecessor, Paul Morton. Mr. Bonaparte says: "If circumstances remain as they now are, I see no reason to suppose that the number of ships in our navy need increase; on the contrary, it is reasonable to anticipate that their number will be reduced, and even reduced materially, within the next five years." We imagine, however, that the chief ground for this change of policy has been the pressure at Washington of the tremendous growing opposition throughout the nation to the policy of costly and rapid naval expansion pursued for the last ten years — an opposition which, as will be remembered, came near to defeating in the House of Representatives the naval program of last winter. Does Secretary Bonaparte look for an international agreement at the coming Hague Conference for a material reduction in the armaments of the world? It would seem so, from the language quoted above. Some great surprises, doubtless, await the world, as a result of that Conference when it meets.

New British Ministry.

The Balfour Ministry has resigned and left the stage, and a Liberal Cabinet under the Premiership of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has come into office. There is a general feeling on both sides of the water that the new ministry will on the whole be more favorable to the cause of international peace than the former one; though it must be confessed that in the matter of the settlement of the

North Sea incident, the conclusion of treaties of obligatory arbitration, and the agreement with France for the pacific settlement of all outstanding differences, the Balfour Ministry, in spite of its miserable blunders in other foreign matters, has done most notable service in the direction of peace. In his first speech after accepting the Premiership Sir Henry spoke a good word for the maintenance of friendly relations with foreign countries. He particularly referred to Russia and Germany, we are glad to say. This utterance will give added strength to the movement for better feeling between England and Germany, which is being vigorously carried forward under the direction of the Anglo-German Committee which was created at the Lucerne Peace Congress. The new Premier laid emphasis on what he considers to be the natural tendency of the present fiscal policy of Great Britain to preserve peace. It will give universal satisfaction among the friends of liberty and justice everywhere to know that the new government has decided to put a stop to the importation of coolies into South Africa, until a South African parliament elected by the people shall have pronounced on the subject. This action, which means probably the entire destruction of the importation of cheap contract labor, has raised a storm of indignant protest among the Randholders and their friends, but it is sure to strengthen the new Cabinet with the masses of the British people. The general election will come off soon, and our British peace friends are making elaborate preparations to turn it to the best possible account in the choice of members of parliament.

Russia.

We have hoped day after day to see some ray of promise that the worst of the crisis in Russia was passed. But up to the present writing none has appeared. December has been a month of horrors, the scanty details of which that have come to us giving probably no adequate conception of the awful atrocities enacted. Assassination, massacre, mob violence, barricades, incendiarism, race hatred and murder, Cossack butcheries, arrests of labor leaders, fierce battles in the streets between the government forces and infuriated revolutionists, piles of slaughtered "beardless boys," women and children shot down promiscuously — it would be difficult to imagine a sadder and more distressing picture. And whence has it all come? It is traceable, every bit of it, in the last analysis, to the system of brutal domination which has held Russia in chains from time immemorial. No more miserable and gigantic failure of the law of might can be found on the pages of history. More immediately, it is the trail of the recent war, which has thrown its terrible burdens and multiplied disasters over the whole of the vast Empire. The people have at last been driven to a point where they will bear no more. In the madness of their passions, at last breaking through all restraint, they have hurled themselves here and there in desperation against the forces which they conceive to have wrought their desolation. In a condition like this masses of people do not discriminate, and recognize what they might attain at less cost by slower and more rational methods. What the early outcome of the conflict may be cannot yet be prophesied. The government may save itself for the moment by the weight of its brutal power and beat down the revolution, but unless it turns away from its brutalism, and proceeds boldly and courageously in the ways of freedom and popular rights on which it has started, it will die at last a miserable death at the hands of those whose souls it has so long held in bondage. And the quicker it abandons its brutalism the better. Let it cease to fire on the strikers, or even on the infuriated mobs; let it dismiss all its Cossack soldiers, and if possible send the last one of them out of the country, and return all its other military instruments to their barracks, beseeching the people to come to conference, and promising them sincerely that they shall have true popular constitutional government, and the fearful storm would die away in less than a week. As a man soweth, as a nation soweth, so shall it reap.

Understanding Germany.

We invite the special attention of our readers to the very able article in this number on "The Peace Movement and Germany" by Dr. Ernst Richard, head of the German Department in Columbia University. Dr. Richard is the president of the New York German Peace Society, composed now of nearly one hundred members, and is doing effective and splendid work in bringing Germans into the peace movement. We think he somewhat overstates the German case in certain particulars. There are very few people anywhere who seriously consider Germany behind other countries in civilization. He is possibly also a little oversensitive to criticisms of his native country, as most people are in regard to their fatherland. But his main contention is correct, that Germany has been much misunderstood and misrepresented. The German-baiting, of which he speaks, in the American and the English press and among a certain class of our public men, has been exceedingly unjust and shameful. We have often condemned it ourselves and do not think his disapprobation of it any too strong. The German Emperor and the German people have their marked "weaknesses" towards militarism, as Dr. Richard does not deny, and it is not difficult to find things in recent German colonial action open to severe reprobation, but the notion prevalent in some quarters

that Germany and every single German is aching for a fight with some big country and is boiling over with the desire to descend headlong upon somebody somewhere, with a big army and navy, is too absurd to find any credence whatever. The first requisite to closer international friendship and harmony is mutual understanding. The peace movement is taking deep and comparatively rapid hold in Germany, and if people would only take the trouble to learn the real character and disposition of the German people they would find a much better state of things than many of them imagine. We thank Dr. Richard for setting the matter forth so clearly as he has. He desires that the peace movement may make the most rapid progress possible in his native land, and that no inexcusable obstacles may be kept in the way.

Pennsylvania Peace Society.

The Pennsylvania Peace Society held its thirty-ninth annual meeting in the Young Friends Auditorium, Philadelphia, on the 7th of December. The speakers were Judge William N. Ashman, president of the Society, Hon. Richard Bartholdt, member of Congress from Missouri, State Treasurer-elect Berry, and Rev. S. F. Hershey, LL.D., of Wooster, Ohio. Dr. Hershey spoke on "The Place of John Hay in the Peace Movement," State Treasurer Berry on "The Foundation of the Temple of Peace," and Mr. Bartholdt on the "Progress of the Peace Movement during the Past Year." The latter's speech, if one may judge by the brief reports given in the papers, went directly to the quick on a number of points. He deplored the fact that our school text-books of history characterize soldiers as the greatest of heroes. The school should be used to curb and not to encourage the brute instincts of children. Everything that smacks of war, including military drills, should be excluded from the school. The peace of the world, he said, had been nominally, but nothing more than nominally, established by the so-called Roosevelt Peace of Portsmouth. Such a peace is really not peace at all, but only an armistice. The peace of the world is to-day very unstable, and may be disturbed at any time, even by a single individual. There is a strong feeling everywhere for disarmament, the question being rather an economical than a military one, in the speaker's view. He declared it to be America's duty and privilege to set the example in the way of peace and justice and square dealing with all nations. Mr. Bartholdt does not believe that the peace of the world can ever be assured against the occasional inroads of war until the nations have set up a complete international organization holding substantially the same relation to the different governments that our national government holds to the various states constituting the Union.

A Military Prize Essayist.

The inevitable tendencies of militarism towards despotism, in one form or another, are constantly manifesting themselves. The other day Col. J. S. Pettit of the Eighth United States Infantry read before the Military Service Institution in New York an essay on which he had been awarded a prize. In this essay he declared it to be a self-evident proposition that a democracy based upon the will of the people cannot be as skillful or as efficient in the conduct of military affairs as a monarchy unfettered by the spoils system and not indebted to politicians. This has often been asserted in past years, and particularly by military men. It would be easy to cite striking examples to prove the falseness of the proposition, but there is no doubt that it has a good deal of historic justification if one takes into account a sufficient number of wars. But if it be true, what is to be done? Pull down our democracy and put monarchical absolutism in its place? That is what Colonel Pettit and his like would logically recommend, though they do not dare to say so openly. They would at least, as many of them do, go so far as to advocate compulsory military service, which is a form of tyranny and slavery. No; the course which a democracy ought to pursue is to reduce militarism to an ever lower minimum, until it finally destroys it entirely. The democratic state exists for the welfare of the people, the whole people, and not for the advancement and efficiency of the governing and the military classes. The more extended and efficient militarism is made, even though it may prove mighty in the conduct of war, the more certain the people are to be reduced to increasing subjection, hardships and political silence. This is the plain lesson of history, and the American people know enough about it not to allow themselves to be duped by prize essays such as that of Colonel Pettit.

Proposed Hague Day.

The Arbitration and Peace Society of Cincinnati, one of the most vigorous of the new societies auxiliary to the American Peace Society, under date of December 2 sent the following letter to President Roosevelt, inviting him to give his support to the effort to secure the general observance of the 18th day of May throughout the nation:

His Excellency, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

The sane stimulating of sentiment is a good way to increase and intensify public interest in any good cause. It is the opinion of the Cincinnati Arbitration and Peace Society that the annual celebration of the opening of the Hague Conference, May 18, 1899, will do much to spread the fundamental doctrine of the Brotherhood of Man, and to further the cause of International Arbitration in encouraging the development of the virtues of humanity, the solidarity of nations and the ultimate abandonment of wars, except as against unjust rebellion and foreign invasion. The State Superintendents of Education of Massachusetts and Ohio promulgated early in this

year recommendations that the day be observed in all the public schools in their respective states, in order that the children and youth may early receive instruction in the principles of universal benevolence and inspiration to just ideas of patriotism. In these states and in New York City the day was well observed in the public schools.

The celebrations of February 22, May 30, and July 4, might well be supplemented by the general recognition of May 18, and I write, Mr. President, in behalf of our Society, to express a great desire and hope that you may find it in harmony with your own sentiment and inclination to proclaim May 18 a day to be observed each year, and the same to be known as "Hague Day."

I have the honor to be,
Very sincerely your obedient servant,
WM. CHRISTIE HERRON, *President.*

The idea has been broached, as our readers know, of trying to secure the recognition of the 18th of May as an *international holiday*. It is hardly to be expected that this can be realized at the present time, until a more general observance of the day has come into vogue within the separate nations. This latter seems now practically certain to occur, and we see no reason why President Roosevelt should not use his great influence towards its general observance in this country.

W. C. T. U. Peace Work.

A copy of the eighteenth annual report of Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey, superintendent of the Peace and Arbitration Department of the National W. C. T. U., has just come into our hands. It shows a year of steady, persistent work, not only by the superintendent, but by the local workers in many parts of the country — among children, in schools, in Sabbath schools, at conventions, etc. The Department has made special efforts to counteract boys' brigades in churches and military drill in the schools, to have religious and Sunday-school books and other literature kept free from anything of a military nature. It has written all the leading publishing houses in the United States on the subject. It has also entered its official protest against the continued increase of the navy. The Department was represented at the Fourteenth International Peace Congress at Lucerne. Mrs. Bailey's report dwells with satisfaction upon the many encouraging events of the past year, which indicate a rapid development of sentiment against war and in favor of the completion of the organization of permanent peace among the nations. Her State superintendents in California, Maine, Iowa, New Jersey, Florida, Ohio, Indiana, Rhode Island, Kansas, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Illinois, Arkansas, Massachusetts, South Dakota, Colorado and North Carolina, have sent in interesting statements of the work done in their various localities, which Mrs. Bailey has incorporated into her report. Mrs. Bailey feels, as many of the rest of us feel, that "humanity was never before favored with such visible fulfillment of the angels' prophetic song, 'On earth peace, goodwill to men.'" This great department of the greatest organization of women in the world is itself one of the clearest signs of this wonderful fulfillment. We regret that so many state and county branches of the W. C. T. U. have not yet taken up this work with earnestness and enthusiasm. It ought to appeal to them with peculiar force.

Race Hatred.

Race hatred is one of the worst possible obstacles to the progress of humanity. Perhaps we ought to call it race contempt, for this is the character which it most frequently takes. What a terrible rôle it has played in the history of the world! And what fearful mischief it still does occasionally in places, in spite of the general evolution away from it which has taken place in civilized countries. Witness the awful Jewish massacres in parts of Russia recently, which make one query whether after all men — some men — are anything more than fiends, which have got temporarily out of their proper habitat and polished themselves up externally a bit. If all that comes to us from the South is to be taken at even half its face value, prejudice against the negroes is taking on a new form of expression recently, which, if it continues, is full of ill-omen for the country. This new phase of proposed negro-treatment — deportation or extermination — is not much heard of throughout the North. The article which we publish elsewhere by a Southern man, E. A. Brenholtz, well known for his high humanitarianism and fine sense of justice, indicates that it is becoming alarmingly frequent in the Southern States. It goes without saying that every friend of peace and justice must throw his whole influence against any suggestion so full of contemplated injustice and wrong. We cannot believe that the better part of the Southern population will, on second thought, give any countenance to the proposed crime against the negroes, and we hope, for the sake of our common country, that what has come to Mr. Brenholtz's knowledge through Southern papers and otherwise, some of which we have seen, entirely misrepresents the South in general.

Prominent Advocates of Peace Gone.

Since our last issue two prominent vice-presidents of the American Peace Society, Edward Atkinson of Boston and Philip C. Garrett of Philadelphia, have passed away. They were both men of large powers and of wide influence in their special spheres of activity.

Mr. Atkinson was an economist and approached questions from the economist's point of view, his economics however being saturated through and through with conscience and a fine, clear sense of right and justice. He was the foremost statistician in America and had only

one or two equals anywhere. Though not a radical peace man theoretically, the ordinary wars of history, especially those of recent years, were to him an abomination and a heinous crime. No more powerful blows were ever dealt war than he dealt it by his figures. The only answer that could be made to his arraignment was ridicule and mockery. To imperialism in all its forms he was a relentless foe, and he never could quite forgive our national government for the fatal steps which it had taken away from the fundamental principles of the national life. He was a zealous advocate of the extension of the principle of neutralization in the interests of justice and peace, not only to land territories, but also to the great trade routes of the ocean, the Massachusetts State Board of Trade plan for the neutralization of these routes having originated with him. He had a strong faith that commerce would some day make war entirely impossible.

Mr. Garrett, one of the foremost and best-known citizens of Philadelphia, was a life-long advocate of peace. He proceeded from the religious and ethical standpoint. He was a Friend, and held all war to be unchristian and immoral, though he was patient and tolerant toward those who could not go as far as he in its condemnation. He took prominent part until recently in many meetings and conferences held for the promotion of the cause in a practical way — at Mohonk, at Washington and elsewhere. In civic life he was a great force for good. A generation ago he was the chairman of the Committee of One Hundred which temporarily redeemed Philadelphia from corrupt politics. As an Indian Commissioner, appointed by President Grant and continued till the time of his death, he contributed much toward the successful carrying out of Grant's Indian Peace Policy. He was a member of the Historical Society of Philadelphia, of the Academy of Natural Sciences and the American Philosophical Society.

Brevities.

. . . On December 16 Baron von Sternberg, the German ambassador at Washington, informed Secretary Root at the State Department that the threatened trouble between Germany and Brazil growing out of the reported attack by German sailors from the gunboat "Panther" at the Brazilian port of Itajahy, had been averted and the incident had been amicably adjusted.

. . . Mr. Jaurès, the Socialist leader in the French Chamber of Deputies, speaking against militarism on the 15th of December, commented at length and favorably on that portion of President Roosevelt's message dealing with arbitration. He deplored the fact that his own country had not taken the lead in calling the second Hague Conference. He uttered a warning against the continuation of the "armed peace," which he declared to be as dangerous as war. As an example, in Russia, he said, the troops of the standing army had been used for the oppression of the people.

. . . It is announced that the Moroccan Conference, in which France, Germany, Italy, Great Britain and other powers will take part, will probably meet on the 10th of this month, and at Madrid instead of Algeciras, as heretofore announced. We wonder what part their high-mightinesses will allow Morocco herself to have in the meeting!

. . . Since the foregoing note was written the Sultan of Morocco has objected to the holding of the Conference at Madrid, and it will probably be held elsewhere.

. . . The Emperor of Germany, speaking at a reception at Brunswick on December 16, declared that "he was happy because it had been possible for him to keep peace for the German Empire until the present time."

. . . The Christmas issue of the *Independent* (130 Fulton Street, New York) is a valuable peace number. It contains an article by Mr. Hayne Davis on "The World's Peace Makers," one by Hon. Richard Bartholdt on "The Demand of the Hour" (an International Congress), and one by Dr. William Hayes Ward on "Peace before the Angels' Song." The editorial entitled "A White Christmas" has also valuable reflections on the growing peace temper of the nations.

. . . Prof. Frederick de Martens, the distinguished arbitrator and authority on international law, has resigned the professorship of international law at St. Petersburg, which he has held for many years. Professor De Martens, it will be remembered, was one of the Russian peace commissioners at Portsmouth. He has served as a member of many arbitration boards, and is one of the Russian members of the Hague Court.

. . . The *Correspondance Bi-mensuelle* of the Berne Peace Bureau, in its issue of the 10th of December, the day on which the Nobel prize was awarded, gives an account of a series of lectures which the Baroness von Suttner had just finished in Germany, during which she had visited and spoken in twenty-four cities, including Berlin, Hamburg, Leipzig, Göttingen, Stuttgart and Frankfort. She received many marks of sympathy and of interest in the peace cause, and in places had a real ovation.

. . . The International Medical Peace Association in its meeting at Paris the 27th of November passed a number of resolutions, expressing, among other things, regret at the continuation of the great and expensive armaments, the hope that the various Eastern questions might be settled in a pacific way, and that, following the example of Norway, questions of nationality might be determined by the interested peoples themselves.

. . . Mr. Horace G. Wadlin, librarian of the Boston Public Library, has prepared and published at the end of the December Bulletin of Books added to the Library, a reading list of books and pamphlets under the heading, "The Hague Conference and International Arbitration." It is an admirable list, covering four pages of the Bulletin, and has been prepared to facilitate the task of those who will be making researches in the library on the subject of arbitration in connection with the coming Conference at The Hague. Those wishing a copy of the list should communicate directly with Mr. Wadlin.

. . . The Boston *Transcript* of December 16 published an admirable article by Lucia Ames Mead on the Far

Eastern problems entitled, "Yellow Peril or White Disaster." Copies of the article reprinted from the *Transcript* may be had by addressing Mrs. Mead, at 39 Newbury Street, Boston.

. . . Great Britain has withdrawn her military garrisons from the island of Barbados and from St. Lucia, off the South American coast. That is a good start. Now if she will remove the garrison from Bermuda it will make our Anglo-phobes feel safer from attack by the "terrible" British fleet! or, possibly, it might make them very unhappy, as one of their arguments for new fighting craft would be taken from them.

. . . Six members of the Council of the International Arbitration League (London, 11 Lincoln's Inn Fields, W. C.) will be candidates for Parliament at the coming general election, namely, Mr. Thomas Burt, M. P., Mr. William Randal Cremer, M. P., Mr. George Barnes, Mr. Joseph Maddison, Mr. Isaac Mitchell and Mr. John Ward. We hope Mr. Cremer will be able to take all these men into the House of Commons with him.

Our Comrade, Christ.

BY EDWIN ARNOLD BRENHOLTZ.

I pray for song to cheer my comrade's heart
On Christmas season's glad return;
To strengthen all who nobly do their part
Where fires on Freedom's altars burn.

One gift alone my loyal comrades crave:
An earth where childhood may be blest.
Ah! Christ of Galilee, thy martyr grave
Is hallowed by our wish confess'd.

We call thee Comrade. We can comprehend
Thy toil-worn hands in blessing placed.
O Carpenter beloved! salutes we send
To him the cross left undisgraced.

Thy spirit lives in each of us to-day
Denouncing wrongs on every hand.
O Comrade, we use words, but not to pray,
Till childhood laughs throughout this land.

Through long, sad centuries of cruel wrong
Thy words of Brotherhood come down.
O loyal lips! against wealth's license, strong;
O Lover! for the poor no frown.

Our daily lives shall be incessant prayers
For strength to 'stablish justice here;
Our Comrade Christ, a Christmas shall be theirs,
The earth's oppressed, to thee most dear.

The Ballad of the Boundary Line.

BY H. LAVINIA BAILY.

"Here shall the Boundary Line be laid."
"Not so, but here," the other said.
Clamor of contest ran fierce and high,—
Defiant challenge and proud reply.

For heights of the Andes rose between
The Chilean States and the Argentine:
And the mooted question, day by day,
Was "What doth limit my neighbor's sway?"

The sunlight rose and the shadows fell
On either slope, but none could tell
Just where the morning's magic wand
Touched the Argentine or Chile land.

Fair in their verdure, pure in their snow,
So near to heaven their summits go—
Why should they ever by man be trod?
'T would seem they should only belong to God.

But the strife went on with passing years,
Fed by resentment and pride and fears;
Nor priest nor people could yet define
The rightful range of the Boundary Line.

The strife went on with its loss and shame,
As generations went and came,
And each in its turn the task essayed
To solve the problem so long delayed.

* * * * * * * * * *

Then kinder, kinglier thought prevailed,
Where threat of sword and gun had failed;
And love-illumined reason wrought
The adjustment long so vainly sought.

"For how can a trifle of earth and air
With the worth of human lives compare?
And what can it matter if thine or mine
Be the narrow side on the Boundary Line?

"And why should greed and grim distrust
Despoil us of our faith and trust?
Enough, enough, let us pledge our word
To settle by judgment, not by sword.

"Let us heed the counsel our good priests bring,
And raise the standard of Christ our King,
And the here or there of the Boundary Line
Let God and the British king define."

Then the mother-heart of the nation stirred,
As the fair De Costa's plea was heard:
"Fathers and brothers! warriors, men!
Shall we give our bravest to death and pain?

"Shall we hush our hearts as we see them go—
God pity!—to strive with a brother foe?
And long we have waited, have suffered and prayed
For a joy still denied us, a hope still delayed.

"Enough; let the sun in highest heaven
Pencil the line for which you have striven;
Let a princely people on either side
In friendship and fair accord abide;

"Be the strife of the past to the wild winds swept;
The faith of the future unswervingly kept;
And let 'The Christ of the Andes' rest
In token of peace on the mountain's crest."

Grandly the people made reply;
The pledge was taken, the arms laid by,
And glad thanksgiving and festal song
Witnessed the joy of the gathered throng.

Joy! for the strife of the past was o'er;
Joy! for the promise of hate no more;
Joy in the gladness of land and home,
Joy for the world-wide peace to come.

On snow-tipped height of the Andean range
They planted the statue fair and strange;
And there, to the query of the sky,
Its bronze and granite make reply:

"I witness the failure of the sword,
The victory of the Love-sent word;
To dust may crumble rock and hill,
This pledge of nations abideth still."

* * * * * *

So now the Boundary Line is laid;
Christ in the heart hath the conflict stayed;
And now doth "the Christ of the Andes" rest
In token of Peace on the mountain's crest.

The Hague Conference.

From the President's Message.

The first conference of nations held at The Hague in 1899, being unable to dispose of all the business before it, recommended the consideration and settlement of a number of important questions by another conference to be called subsequently and at an early date. These questions were the following: (1) The rights and duties of neutrals; (2) the limitation of the armed forces on land and sea, and of military budgets; (3) the use of new types and calibres of military and naval guns; (4) the inviolability of private property at sea in times of war; (5) the bombardment of ports, cities and villages by naval forces. In October, 1904, at the instance of the Interparliamentary Union, which, at a conference held in the United States and attended by the lawmakers of fifteen different nations, had reiterated the demand for a second conference of nations, I issued invitations to all the powers signatory to the Hague Convention to send delegates to such a conference, and suggested that it be again held at The Hague. In its note of December 16, 1904, the United States government communicated to the representatives of foreign governments its belief that the Conference could be best arranged under the provisions of the present Hague treaty.

From all the powers acceptance was received, coupled in some cases with the condition that we should wait until the end of the war then waging between Russia and Japan. The Emperor of Russia, immediately after the treaty of peace which so happily terminated this war, in a note presented to the President on September 13, through Ambassador Rosen, took the initiative in recommending that the Conference be now called. The United States government in response expressed its cordial acquiescence, and stated that it would, as a matter of course, take part in the new Conference and endeavor to further its aims. We assume that all civilized governments will support the movement, and that the Conference is now an assured fact. This government will do everything in its power to secure the success of the Conference to the end that substantial progress may be made in the cause of international peace, justice and goodwill.

This renders it proper at this time to say something as to the general attitude of this government toward peace. More and more war is coming to be looked upon as in itself a lamentable and evil thing. Wanton or useless war, or a war of mere aggression,— in short, any war begun or carried on in a conscienceless spirit,— is to be condemned as a peculiarly atrocious crime against all humanity. We can, however, do nothing of permanent value for peace unless we keep ever clearly in mind the ethical element which lies at the root of the problem. Our aim is righteousness. Peace is normally the handmaiden of righteousness; but when peace and righteousness conflict, then a great and upright people can never for a moment hesitate to follow the path which leads toward righteousness, even though that path also leads to war. There are persons who advocate peace at any price; there are others who, following a false analogy, think that because it is no longer necessary in civilized countries for individuals to protect their rights with a strong hand, it is therefore unnecessary for nations to be ready to defend their rights. These persons would do irreparable harm to any nation that adopted their principles, and even as it is they seriously hamper the cause which they advocate by tending to render it absurd in the eyes of sensible and patriotic men.

There can be no worse foe of mankind in general, and of his own country in particular, than the demagogue of war, the man who in mere folly or to serve his own selfish ends continually rails at and abuses other nations, who seeks to excite his countrymen against foreigners on insufficient pretexts, who excites and inflames a perverse and aggressive national vanity, and who may on occasions wantonly bring on conflict between his nation and some other nation. But there are demagogues of peace just as there are demagogues of war, and in any such movement as this for the Hague Conference it is essential not to be misled by one set of extremists any more than by the other. Whenever it is possible for a nation or an individual to work for a real peace, assuredly it is failure of duty not so to strive; but if war is necessary and righteous, then either the man or the nation shrinking from it forfeits all title to self-respect.

We have scant sympathy with the sentimentalist who dreads oppression less than physical suffering, who would prefer a shameful peace to the pain and toil sometimes lamentably necessary in order to secure a righteous peace. As yet there is only a partial and imperfect analogy between international law and internal or municipal law, because there is no sanction of force for executing the former, while there is in the case of the latter. The private citizen is protected in his rights by the law, because the law rests in the last resort upon force exercised through the forms of law. A man does not have to defend his rights with his own hand, because he can call upon the police, upon the sheriff's posse, upon the militia, or in certain extreme cases upon the army, to defend him. But there is no sanction of force for international law.

At present there could be no greater calamity than for the free peoples, the enlightened, independent and peace-loving peoples, to disarm, while yet leaving it open to any barbarism or despotism to remain armed. So long as the world is as unorganized as now, the armies and navies of those peoples who on the whole stand for justice offer not only the best, but the only possible security for a just peace. For instance, if the United States alone, or in company only with the other nations that on the whole tend to act justly, disarmed, we might sometimes avoid bloodshed, but we would cease to be of weight in securing the peace of justice — the real peace for which the most law-abiding and high-minded men must at times

be willing to fight. As the world is now, only that nation is equipped for peace that knows how to fight and that will not shrink from fighting if ever the conditions become such that war is demanded in the name of the highest morality.

So much it is emphatically necessary to say in order both that the position of the United States may not be misunderstood and that a genuine effort to bring nearer the day of the peace of justice among the nations may not be hampered by a folly, which, in striving to achieve the impossible, would render it hopeless to attempt the achievement of the practical. But while recognizing most clearly all above set forth, it remains our clear duty to strive in every practical way to bring nearer the time when the sword shall not be the arbiter among nations. At present the practical thing to do is to try to minimize the number of cases in which it must be the arbiter, and to offer, at least to all civilized powers, some substitute for war which will be available in at least a considerable number of instances.

Very much can be done through another Hague Conference in this direction, and I most earnestly urge that this nation do all in its power to try to further the movement and to make the result of the decisions of the Hague Conference effective. I earnestly hope that the Conference may be able to devise some way to make arbitration between nations the customary way of settling international disputes in all save a few classes of cases, which should themselves be as sharply defined and rigidly limited as the present governmental and social development of the world will permit. If possible, there should be a general arbitration treaty negotiated among all the nations represented at the Conference. Neutral rights and property should be protected at sea as they are protected on land. There should be an international agreement to this purpose and a similar agreement defining contraband of war.

During the last century there has been a distinct diminution in the number of wars between the most civilized nations. International relations have become closer, and the development of the Hague Tribunal is not only a symptom of this growing closeness of relationship, but is a means by which the growth can be furthered. Our aim should be from time to time to take such steps as may be possible toward creating something like an organization of the civilized nations, because as the world becomes more highly organized the need for navies and armies will diminish. It is not possible to secure anything like an immediate disarmament, because it would first be necessary to settle what peoples are on the whole a menace to the rest of mankind, and to provide against the disarmament of the rest being turned into a movement which would really chiefly benefit these obnoxious peoples; but it may be possible to exercise some check upon the tendency to swell indefinitely the budgets for military expenditure. Of course, such an effort could succeed only if it did not attempt to do too much, and if it were undertaken in a spirit of sanity as far removed as possible from a merely hysterical psuedo-philanthropy.

It is worth while pointing out that since the end of the insurrection in the Philippines this nation has shown its practical faith in the policy of disarmament by reducing its little army one-third. But disarmament can never be of prime importance; there is more need to get rid of the causes of war than of the implements of war.

I have dwelt much on the dangers to be avoided by steering clear of any mere foolish sentimentality, because my wish for peace is so genuine and earnest; because I have a real and great desire that this second Hague Conference may mark a long stride forward in the direction of securing the peace of justice throughout the world. No object is better worthy the attention of enlightened statesmanship than the establishment of a surer method than now exists of securing justice as between nations, both for the protection of the little nations and for the prevention of war between the big nations. To this aim we should endeavor not only to avert bloodshed, but, above all, effectively to strengthen the forces of right. The Golden Rule should be, and as the world grows in morality it will be, the guiding rule of conduct among nations as among individuals; though the Golden Rule must not be construed in fantastic manner as forbidding the exercise of the police power. This mighty and free republic should ever deal with all other states, great or small, on a basis of high honor, respecting their rights as jealously as it safeguards its own.

The Peace Movement and Germany.

From a German Point of View.

BY DR. ERNST RICHARD, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

It seems to be the settled opinion of a great many friends of the peace movement, even of some German pacifists, that Germany is the one peace disturbing element of Europe. If Germany only would give back Alsace-Lorraine to France, reduce her army and abolish her navy, then harmony would reign supreme! Some friends of peace seem to be almost willing to urge war on Germany to avoid an imaginary breach of peace on her part. Coalitions are proposed of the "most civilized nations" to secure peace, and in a great many of these propositions Germany is left out, not being advanced far enough in civilization. One prominent philanthropist, who formerly used to include Germany in his benevolent plans of federation, has dropped her of late, and is reported to have given as an explanation that Germany would always be a second class power which could be considered a negligible quantity. If I add that Mr. Delcassé and King Edward have been praised in peace meetings and peace journals as the greatest promoters of peace, I have given a selection of opinions which, although not by any means the official expression of the representatives of the peace movement, still are voiced frequently enough to raise the question: Do the people who express these views think that the goodwill of Germany is not desirable or necessary to promote the cause of the peaceful settlement of international difficulties? That I should receive an affirmative answer to this question is, of course, not to be assumed.

Certainly the attitude of Germany does not appear at all friendly towards pacifism, and it will be a very difficult task to convince her — that is, her government and the majority of her people — that she can protect her peaceful development in any other way than by an army of surpassing strength and a navy sufficient to protect her coast line. This feeling of Germany is due principally to her historical development, of which I shall say

a few words below. But opinions like those quoted above, coming from those interested in the peace movement in sufficient strength to appear influential, are apt not only to confirm their conviction of the necessity of being "*toujours en vedette*," but make the peace movement appear to a great many Germans as supporting the adversaries of the young empire.

Before I try to explain this German point of view,— which I think must be well understood if we want our cause to win a greater number of friends in Germany,— let me say a few words of the so-called autocratic power of the Emperor. Some people do not seem to know that the Emperor is not even the sovereign of Germany; that he is simply the president of the sovereign states whose federation is called the German Empire, and the commander-in-chief of the army who has not the power to declare war except with the consent of the federated governments. The German constitution grants suffrage much more extensively than the other constitutionally governed states, with a very few exceptions. If the present Emperor seems to have his way in almost everything, as if he possessed autocratic power, the explanation must be found in his strong personality and in the conviction of the majority of the Germans that his untiring zeal and industrious efforts have no other aim but the best interests of the fatherland. There is no constitutional reason why a strong opposition, under leaders of equal personal strength with the Emperor, might not prevent the execution of any unpopular measure which the latter proposes.

Another point must likewise not be overlooked: the German army is not an army of mercenaries, but it is the people in arms, and the horrors of wars gain quite a personal character when every family sends father, son or brother to the battlefield; even Bismarck declared that in a country with universal compulsory military service no war can be waged except for the strongest national reasons — reasons national to such an extent that their force is recognized by the great majority of the people.

It was amongst this armed people, after the experience of three wars, that William I., after accepting the crown of the German empire, used these words: "May God grant to me and my successors to the imperial crown to be ever the augmenter of the empire, *not in martial conquests*, but *in the possession and gifts of peace*, on the field of national welfare, liberty and morals." No European nation can accuse Germany of having deviated from this program. The ever-increasing population made it advisable to find a place where the surplus might be saved for the fatherland, and the colonial policy was entered upon in order not to find one day all the world closed against German enterprise. Of course, the view that the world belongs to the white people, and that the other races have only as much right as they have power to fight for, is not up for argument in this article. The question we try to answer here is, whether Germany is really the disturber of peace in Europe. This is to be answered in the negative as long as a proof is wanting that Germany ever tried to break into the program outlined by her Emperor on the birthday of the empire.

This new empire naturally caused some change in the previous European equipoise, but no fair-minded person will deny to the Germans their right of national unity, and it is incumbent upon the other nations to get used to the new order of things, which, from 1648, they had so successfully prevented. The Germans know their own history; they knew that their internal strife had been used by their neighbors to take possession of German soil even in times of peace without even the trouble of looking for an excuse to declare war; they knew that the great powers again and again had prevented them from securing the well-merited rewards of their victories; that these powers were to blame that German unity was not accomplished; that after German prowess had aided in delivering Europe from the tyranny of Napoleon, the French, the Russians and the English treated them with studied contempt, and dictated the internal policy of German states; in short, they remembered, and remember to-day, that since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, when the "European Balance of Power" was first established, their history was nothing but a continuous ill-treatment, one breach of trust after another on the part of these powers.

It will therefore take very strong evidence that these powers will not take advantage of the weakening of her defensive strength before Germany will be inclined to listen to any proposition of disarmament. The first proposition of this kind was made in the Reichstag by Rudolf Virchow in 1869. Only twenty-five representatives were willing that it should be discussed at all. I wonder what he thought himself about this proposal, when less than three quarters of a year afterwards the cry, "*A Berlin, à Berlin!*" was heard on the streets of Paris? This experience has not helped to make the work of our friends of the German peace societies easier. However, when a similar proposition was brought up in the Reichstag not ten years later, it found sufficient support to be placed on the order of the day, and an interesting discussion took place. Bismarck took part in it and declared that he was quite willing to accept the proposition, if Germany's neighbors would allow him to do so.

In spite of all prejudices against William II., and of the apprehensions felt at the time of his accession to the throne, this peaceful policy has been continued. His most imprudent act in regard to international policy was his telegram to President Kruger,— an impulsive expression of feelings no friend of justice can find much fault with. His reluctance to accede to the proposals of the Hague Conference is due to the German conviction that peace rests on the strength of the army and to the German distrust, the product of more than two centuries of misplaced confidence. A close study of German history will show many facts on which these views are based, too many for enumeration in this article. Let me say that the average German is, with the Emperor, of the opinion expressed by a prominent liberal politician in the following words: "We have to take into account the mistrust and the ill-will of all those who by our new power are disappointed in any hopes or desires. If our neighbors were not likewise at odds with one another, and if we had not our fear-inspiring militarism, we should be in the condition of Prussia when Frederic II. was compelled to fight against the whole of Europe of his time."

While the Emperor has pronounced repeatedly his adherence to the peaceful program of his grandfather, he has never failed to see that the few open markets left after Germany had become strong enough to assert herself should not be closed to the future development of

German commerce, the sale of the products of German industry being of vital importance for the maintenance of an ever-growing population. The Triple Alliance, the best and tested guarantee of European peace, so Germans think, was reassured by his personal friendly calls on the monarchs in question, when, shortly after Mr. Delcassé had become the French minister of Foreign Affairs, there set in a persistent diplomatic action towards the isolation of Germany, accompanied by an unheard of German-baiting campaign by part of the English, French and American press, which showed evidence of meditated direction. For those who, like the foreign office, saw the secret weaving of the threads, the famous colonial treaty between France and England seemed a part of this scheme, which even comprised a breaking up of the Triple Alliance. In this Anglo-French treaty certain well-known plans about the "peaceful penetration of Morocco" were proposed, which entirely ignored treaty rights held by Germany, and it was not considered worth while to give Germany official information of the proceedings.

The Emperor did not act until an inquiry from the Sultan of Morocco as to what stand he would take towards the French proposals in view of his treaty obligations compelled him to make plain his position. Instead of showing, according to precedent, by a naval demonstration in a Moroccan port, that he was not willing to have Germany slighted, he interrupted his Mediterranean recreation cruise for two hours by his now historical visit to Tangiers. Before he left Bremen for his momentous trip, he was careful to assert again the peaceful program laid down by his grandfather. He made a remarkable speech, in which he asserts as his ideal of a world empire, that "above all the newly created Germany should enjoy on all sides the most absolute confidence as a quiet, honest, peaceful neighbor, and that it should be founded not on conquests by the sword, but by the mutual confidence of nations working for the same ideals."

The developments showed that the suspicions of the German government were well founded. Delcassé felt compelled to resign his position as head of the French Cabinet. No matter how much or how little truth there is in the so-called revelations made by him which seemed to show England's readiness to support the French government's schemes, the result of the whole affair has been a remarkable improvement of the relations between France and Germany, such as seemed impossible a year ago. Both the French and the German press are to be congratulated on the moderate and conciliatory stand they have taken during the whole controversy, and there seems to be a good prospect that the outcome of this whole Morocco question will be, if not an *entente cordiale*, still, as a leading German paper says, an *entente loyale* between the late enemies.

A great mistrust of England, however, has taken root in Germany. The truth of the revelations in the *Matin* gained in probability by the sudden visit of an English fleet in the Baltic Sea at a time when manœuvres of the German navy were in progress in the same waters, as well as by certain actions or omissions of King Edward and utterances of his private secretary, Sir Knollys, which were interpreted, rightly or wrongly, as intentional slights on the German Court. In the meantime the press campaign in the English and American papers went on lustily on the principle of the old adage, "*Calumniate fortiter; semper aliquid haeret.*"

For years the German foreign office has been kept busy denying all kinds of open falsehoods and covert insinuations. Let me enumerate a few instances taken from leading — not "yellow" — American papers of the last few months. During the negotiations at Portsmouth it was constantly asserted that the German Emperor used his influence to persuade the Czar to continue the war to the bitter end; indeed, that German intrigues had caused the whole war from the beginning. On the very day when President Roosevelt's telegram, showing the important part the Kaiser had in bringing about the peace, proved that accusation futile, a leader appeared, in a "decent" New York paper, saying that Germany intended to annex Holland. This was followed by the exposure of certain alleged German schemes, as to the marriage of the Spanish king, the throne of Norway, the establishment of Hungary as a separate kingdom under a Hohenzollern prince, etc. The last was the claim that the German Emperor had proposed to the Czar a division of the Habsburg monarchy between Germany and Russia and that Germany had offered armed assistance for the suppression of the revolt in Poland.

The result of all this is an immense awakening of militant patriotism in Germany and an exceptional willingness even of the opposition parties to allow the government's demands for an increase of the navy.

I have gone into this matter somewhat extensively to show that the political developments of the last months have considerably strengthened the position of those Germans who believe in armed peace. In his speech from the throne, with which the Emperor opened the present session of the Reichstag, occurs the following passage, which, I think, after the foregoing explanation, will appear to be well worthy of consideration by the friends of peace: "Looking at Germany's own international position, one must not fail to observe that *we have constantly to deal with a misconception of the German way of thinking and with prejudices against the progress of German industry.* The peace of the German people is a sacred trust to me, but the signs of the times impose on our nation the duty to strengthen her defenses against unjust aggression. The more we will be sure to succeed in realizing the peaceful purposes of our tested alliance with the rulers of Austria-Hungary and Italy, in future, as we have done in the past." That the Emperor's words represent the view of the great majority of the Germans cannot be doubted; neither can it be doubted that he is justified in his remarks about misconceptions and prejudices.

We may summarize the results of our observations in this article so far by saying that the Germans want peace, but that history has taught them to mistrust their neighbors, and that their own strength is the safest guarantee for peace. Any peace-arbitration propaganda in Germany, therefore, must begin with an effort to restore confidence in the goodwill of the other nations. The Germans have shown no inclination to expand their boundaries by conquest at the expense of their neighbors. It remains with those who claim that Germany is "the" element of danger for the peace of Europe to prove their assertion by facts, not by surmises. In arguing about disarmament with Germans it must not be

overlooked that it will be very difficult to prove that militarism will of necessity impoverish a country, when Germany, as is the case with this country, has continually and wonderfully increased in wealth in spite of the enormous burdens of her military and naval establishments.

After these general remarks about the German view of peace and international relations, my contention that some Germans have a suspicion that the peace movement has been hostile to German interests will appear less startling, and it will be easy to guess what impression some of the utterances and proposals of people prominent in peace circles and applauded by peace meetings will make on the average German.

To refer again to late political events: It will be understood why many Germans do not look with the same feeling of satisfaction on the Anglo-French treaty as the friends of the peace movement do, since they have reason to suspect that it was not dictated by pure love of peace, and why they cannot listen without some astonishment to the praise of Mr. Delcassé and Edward VII. as peacemakers.

As to the proposals of alliances to enforce peace, I have already said that the Germans think the Triple Alliance serves this purpose pretty well. They claim that nobody did a greater service to the cause of European peace than Bismarck, when, after the victories of 1866, he did not unnecessarily humiliate Austria, and, by abstaining from a triumphal entry of the Prussian army into Vienna and from any annexation of Austrian territory, he left the door open to sincere reconciliation and a future alliance.

Of course the Germans must object to being treated as semi-civilized people, not advanced enough to be worthy of an alliance with the Anglo-Saxons or the French. They simply do not understand that the nation that has produced a Kant, a Lessing, a Herder, a Goethe, a Schiller,— men who are not looked upon as ornamental figures in a German pantheon, but are essential experiences and part of the life of the German nation,— as well as Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Wagner, and other leading men too numerous to mention, to whose schools the students of all nations flock and are welcomed in the most liberal and generous way, who are called the teachers of the world and have led in the progress of humanity in more than one important field, should be looked down upon by anybody as inferior. It really seems a position that can be taken only by persons — even if they honestly believe in it — who think that the peaceful settlement of international controversies is only for the privileged few, who are too superior to bother themselves about the others. The times are over when the Germans took that kind of bluff, and it is certainly not in the interests of the peace and arbitration movement to put them in an ugly humor by maintaining it.

The greatest prejudice against the peace movement, however, has been created in Germany by the treatment of the Franco-German relations on the part of the peace congresses, by their failure to take a decided stand against the French efforts to interest the powers in the overthrow of the treaty of Frankfort, to which they had agreed after being defeated in a war which, though welcomed by Prussia, had been begun by themselves. At last the Congress in Lucerne has disposed of this question, as far as the peace movement is concerned; let us hope, forever. But still, as a Swiss paper pointed out, the French sensibilities had to be catered to, by pointing to a settlement by popular vote at the time of a future victory of democracy. Why, the Germans ask, be so considerate of the French sensibilities? Are not the German sensibilities to be taken into consideration at all? For years the French were allowed to speak in peace meetings and writings of the brutalities of the German barbarians. There were not only Frenchmen, but others, even Germans, who seriously proposed that Germany should give up these provinces, or part of them, which had been torn from Germany partly by fraud, partly by breach of peace and treachery, which for the greatest part had never ceased to be German in language and feeling. It is wonderful how some of these peacemakers, like Mr. Robert Stein in this paper a few months ago, want to compensate Germany with other territories, as if they belonged to them; how willing they are, in order to console the French for the poor success of their "*promenade à Berlin*," to commit the grossest injustice against the inhabitants of other territories who never had anything whatever to do with the matter! For years this hope that the public opinion of the civilized world would morally support the French claims has given strength to the military parties of both nations, giving them the best arguments: to the French, for holding out the hope of getting, by the help of others, what they had lost in their own game; to the Germans, for showing the necessity of being ready to defend the provinces which they had reconquered in a war forced upon them, and which they had paid for with the life blood of their youth. And they saw the friends of peace seemingly arrayed on the side of those who wanted to rob them of what was theirs by right, what should have been given back to Germany in 1815, when the wiles of Talleyrand and the jealousies of England, Austria and Russia prevented justice from having her way. Luckily a new generation of Frenchmen are growing up who understand that all hope in this direction is gone, that the people of the provinces themselves have been weaned back to their natural relations and have no desire to return to the people that had not been able to make them forget their nationality during two centuries of allegiance. The work of the French pacifists has been very successful of late. Let me quote, for the benefit of those who still want to placate the French sensibilities at the expense of Germany, a short passage from a letter of the Secretary-General of the Permanent Delegation of the French Peace Societies: "We never shall have permanent peace if we demand of a foreign country what ours never would concede. If we had, in the same way as Prussia conquered Alsace-Lorraine, taken Luxemburg or the Palatinate, would France, in order to restore peaceful relations, ever have agreed to give back what it had taken? The nationalist press would have made it their task to prevent this. There is so much noise about this question of Alsace-Lorraine. Why? Are there no other nations just as worthy of our interest, who by the most infamous force have been robbed not only of their country, but also of their liberty? Let me cite only Poland, Finland, Denmark, the Transvaal as examples."

The purpose of these observations has not been to start a controversy about these German opinions, which I have tried to give, even where I do not share them,

but to serve our cause by bringing about a better understanding of the German way of thinking, which is the first requirement in order to convert them to our views. If anywhere, it is important in Germany to put emphasis on the positive side of our program, in the first place on treaties of arbitration. In spite of her original opposition, Germany has already twice been a party to an appeal to the Hague Tribunal, and has thereby shown her willingness to make use of this institution. Words of approval and recognition of the immense importance of that court are becoming more frequent in the German press, heretofore indifferent or even antagonistic. The most scholarly book on the Hague Convention, by Professor Meurer, has just been published in Germany, and has aroused the interest of the scientific world. But, before all, let our friends rid themselves of the notion that every German is just eager to rush to war and would have done so long ago if he had not been afraid of the peaceful Englishmen, Frenchmen, Americans and Russians. If it is thought worth while to win Germany as well as all other nations for the cause of peace, let no suspicion come up as if anybody did not consider the German as equal to the most civilized nations, or that their peaceful intentions are doubted. The greatest service to our cause would be rendered, however, at present, if our newspapers could be induced to show more justice to Germany instead of welcoming every calumny and giving it all possible prominence without taking notice of official denials; in short, to stop the false impression, now fostered, by the press and press agencies, that Germany is the continuous peace disturber of the civilized world, after she has shown again and again that she wants nothing more than undisturbed peaceful development.

What the Wise Men Did, and What the Wise Men Ought to Do.

BY REV. CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., LL. D., PASTOR OF THE BROADWAY TABERNACLE, NEW YORK CITY.

It was long ago that certain wise men from the East cast their gold and frankincense and myrrh at the feet of a baby in Bethlehem, and as the anniversary of that baby's birth returns one cannot help thinking what a different place to live in this world would be to-day if all the wise men both of the East and the West had during the last nineteen hundred years cast their treasures at the feet of the Prince of Peace, instead of burning them up in the fierce furnace of war.

But at Christmas it is not well for one to bury himself in idle and doleful regrets, marring the melody of a musical day by the lugubrious refrain, "It might have been." Rather should we gird up the loins of our mind, and look hopefully into the future, confidently anticipating better things than any which have been, because God is in his heaven and all will yet be right with the world. Upon the shoulders of that baby born in Bethlehem the government of the world has been placed, and men in increasing numbers are coming from the East and West and North and South to cast their treasures at his feet.

It is a good thing to ponder in the light of the Christmas hearth the meaning of Christ's great title, "Prince of Peace." Christmas, as Charles Dickens long ago asserted, is a kind, forgiving, charitable, pleasant time, the only time in the long calendar of the year when men and women seem by one consent to open their shut-up hearts freely. It is then if ever that we can hear the angels singing, "Peace on earth, goodwill toward men." No matter how sour and grumpy we may have been during the year, his is a hard heart which can withstand the genial warmth of Christmas time. The baser feelings of the heart, its enmities and envyings and jealousies and hatreds, lie down and die when shone upon by the great light of Christmas Day. All ill-will and brutishness and cruelty become hateful and repulsive, and whatever gold and frankincense and myrrh we may carry in our heart is brought out and cast at the feet of love. War is always terrible to one who clearly sees it, but never does it seem so barbarous and fiendish as when seen across the heavenly beauty of a baby's face. Christmas, like a strong winged angel from the court of heaven, holds up before us on Christmas Day the face of the Christ child, and with that face gazing into ours we shudder at the thought of bloodshed and hate, with an intense hatred, inhumanity in all its forms. There is no humanizing, civilizing force under heaven comparable with the witchery of a baby's face. With the Christmas music ringing in our ears the ponderous and plausible arguments in favor of war worn thread bare by the use of ages, and even still repeated by those whose backs are turned to the light, sound very coarse and foolish. War is a tangle of discords and we cannot easily bring ourselves to think of it on a day that breathes harmony and peace. Christmas is a home day, and one cannot think of home and ponder what home means and does and promises without feeling his heart going out with a new intensity of passion against the demon whose special work it is to scatter households and leave the home in ruin.

Christmas is one of the mountain days of the year. Men see farther from the mountain top than they do from any point upon the plain or in the valley. It is what we think and feel in our luminous hours, when the soul is at its best, that it is safe to trust and follow. In our lower moods, when the heart grows dull and sordid, we are not shocked by anything however horrible, and are capable of defending anything however indefensible. It is surprising how far a human soul can fall. And it is still more surprising how high the same soul can climb. Blind to-day, it may see to-morrow; earthly and carnal this week, it may soar as on eagles' wings next week. One month may bear all the ice and snow of winter, while the next month may bring the perfume and the glory of the summer. It is what we feel and see in our radiant hours that proclaims the feelings and the thoughts of God. What a man thinks of war on Christmas Day, surrounded by his family, gives a surer revelation of what war really is than can be gotten from all the pictures of the artists and all the arguments of those who have opposed or defended it. There are moods in which men are ready to cast their gold at the feet of brute force. Such moods are induced oftentimes by the reading of literature lacking in all the elements of humanitarian feeling. There are men so constructed as to be apparently incapable of rising above the level of a slaughter house, and many of these men know how to wield a pen. By the necromancy of genius they blind the eyes of those who read them to the barbarism and hell of war, and so debauch the heart by their sophistry and specious pleading

as to lead men to Cæsar rather than to Christ. From this debasing and paralyzing atmosphere the world needs to escape with the clear air of Christmas Day. From the dull-eyed belligerent scribblers we must make our way to the Prince of Peace. When we see him the soul is ready to cast all its gold at his feet.

There is much to be grateful for at this Christmas season in the year of our Lord 1905. No great war is to-day desolating the earth, as was the case one year ago. The streams of blood on Oriental battlefields have ceased to flow, and the hearts of wives and mothers are no longer pierced and terrified by the cannon's boom. The curtain has been wrung down on the tragedy of blood and death, and although the voice of some wail over the graves of the slain, tens of thousands of hearts which a year ago were weighted down with an intolerable burden have begun to sing again. And what American does not feel proud and grateful that our own strong President was permitted in the providence of God to play so conspicuous a part in persuading two mighty empires to lay down their arms? This is the greatest service which our President has ever rendered to the world. It is the crowning act of a life filled with stirring deeds, and will be remembered generations after the charge up San Juan Hill has faded completely from the minds of men. The lustre of the proudest triumphs of military skill pale before the glory of victories won in the cause of peace. What splendid deed could our brave President have done upon the battlefield to bring the kings of the earth to his feet, as they came with gold of praise and frankincense of thanksgiving on that memorable day when he stood forth the great peacemaker of our century? The old beatitude, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the Sons of God," flashed upon men's eyes with a significance it had never had before. To every discerning heart it became apparent that humanity has already entered on a new era and that hereafter the tallest statues will not be reared to perpetuate the fame of admirals and generals, but to keep alive the memory of those who have brought fresh treasures to cast at the feet of the Prince of Peace.

At this point a ray of light is thrown on the path along which our Republic should travel. If our President is hailed as the foremost man in all the world because he led two empires into the paths of peace, blessed above all the nations of the earth will our country be if she sets herself with flaming heart and steadfast face and unflinching hand to the great task of banishing war from the planet and establishing an enduring international peace. Other nations have won a transient prestige and renown by mighty seeds sown on the field of battle; it is our opportunity to win the crown laid up for the nation which establishes peace throughout the world. Blessed is the Peace-Making Republic, for it shall be called the Republic of God!

One cannot think of peace without thinking of the great national armaments under which christendom is groaning. How do they look in the light of the Christmas glory? What sort of a decoration for Christmas does a battleship make? Does a shell remind one of the songs of the angels? Wise men long ago cast their gold at the feet of Jesus: wise men nowadays think it safer and wiser to cast the gold of the nations into military equipment. This enormous expenditure looks startling when we read of it on Christmas. If the supreme work for men and nations on this earth is to persuade men to sing the angel's song and to breathe the Christlike spirit, it seems strange that no better use for our gold can be discovered than the building of battleships and cruisers. America is rich, but can she afford to spend one hundred millions every year on her navy? If history has anything certain to tell us it is that the foes of a republic are not to be met on the sea, but on the land, and that the enemy most to be feared cannot be reached by a shell. The enemies for which our battleships and cruisers are constructed are the creations of the feverish heart, chimeras of the imagination, hobgoblins of the fancy, phantasms emanating from excited brains; the enemies which our Republic has just reason to fear are not on the sea, neither are they within the range of our longest range guns. With our great cities what they are, we may well ponder the question at this Christmas season whether our gold and frankincense and myrrh might not be more wisely laid at the feet of his children, at the feet of the poor, at the feet of all whose woes lie heavy on the heart of Christ. Russia might help us to decide which policy is that of wisdom. Russia for a generation has been building a navy. She laid her treasures at the feet of the God of War. The result is that her money lies at the bottom of the Sea of Japan, while the proud dynasty of the Romanoffs crouches in terror before the frenzied wrath of a populace whose interests have been shamefully neglected and outrageously betrayed. We need only come to the light of the Christmas story to see how foolish and wicked it is to squander money on guns instead of devoting it to the building of men.

The Christmas of 1905 will not have come to us in vain if it induces us to ask ourselves in soberness at whose feet a nation should cast its gold and frankincense and myrrh, and if it awakens in our hearts the old dream which stirred the Hebrew prophet — the dream of a day long delayed but surely coming when the instruments of slaughter shall be beaten into the implements of industry, and nation shall no longer lift the sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

Inciting to War.

BY EDWIN ARNOLD BRENHOLTZ.

"Come now, let us reason together," says every lover of humanity. Especially at this time when, one awful and disastrous war being concluded, we are so apt to disregard those things in our very midst making for that most terrible of conflicts — a race-war — is it necessary for every lover of peace to be on the alert, and swift to compel to the light and the open those who covertly are inciting to antagonism people who should and could dwell peaceably and happily side by side in any well-governed land.

The reference is, of course, plainly to those now threatening the negroes of the United States of America with extermination at the hands of their white neighbors if they, men, women and children of African blood and darker hued skins, refuse to accept the offered alternative — deportation.

It seems never to have occurred to those so recklessly making these threats and demands that any considerable

portion of the white race would refuse to lend itself to the accomplishment of any such atrocity. Still less, evidently, have they conceived that some justice-loving white men might and would strenuously object to their program of indiscriminate slaughter. Once for all, let it be noted that the writer refuses to consider the proposition of deportation, simply because the eight million blacks in this country will never *voluntarily* accept it. They righteously claim this country as *theirs*, as righteously, and perhaps more so, as the whites who not only "benevolently assimilated" the previous possessors and by a legal fiction gave themselves the soil, but who also captured the ancestors of the blacks and brought them here slaves to till the fertile stolen acres. The black man of America this day has his stake in this country the same as his white neighbor; and the call is to all of us, white as well as black, to reason together, that peace and not discord may prevail.

First, as a white man residing in the South, it is incumbent on me to reason with myself when such a monstrous proposition as the extermination of eight million human beings, because of the crimes of some of them, is proposed. Let me be as law-abiding as the best of white men, and yet conceive how I would receive such a threat were it aimed at those of my own race. Surely I would resist to the death. Calmly, then, I face the fact that when white men seduously spread and propagate so inhuman a solution of the problem confronting not only America, but the world, they are expecting the blacks to be much more forbearing and non-resistant than white people ever have been or ever will be.

It is to the eternal credit of the black race in America that for years they have heard themselves threatened with loss of home and native land, and finally with extermination, and have, as a race, gone quietly about their daily duties and have made not the slightest preparation to resist. Evidently they are trusting the white race; let us merit their trust by silencing their threateners and defamers.

Yet it must not, because of their unresisting attitude, be supposed that, even though the parties most concerned are black men, this stirring of the infamous soil of hate and sowing the evil of strife can be done with impunity. The harvest is sure, and what we have sown, that we and our children shall reap. Though the number of bad men and women among the negroes is not so great as might have been expected from their past history of bondage, and being thrust unprepared into the duties and responsibilities of self-supporting citizenship, still no fair-minded man will deny that the criminally inclined among them are there, and are somewhat numerous. To that class these threats of extermination at some indefinite time in the future can but prove an incentive to present crime, and of stored-up revenge for the day of attempted deportation. And if the number of murders and rapes by men of the black race is now on the increase, it is no more than we, the white people of America, had a right to expect from our apathetic toleration of the teachings of those who, under the guise of love of the white race and care for the real welfare of the blacks, have been, and are, by the agitation of this matter, intentionally or unintentionally coining and accumulating blood money out of this long-suffering race. And still goes on the publication and sale of literature openly belittling every achievement of the recently enfranchised race, and as openly declaring that the one thing a southern white man cannot and will not tolerate is an educated negro. The press, indeed, should be free. The shame is ours that the publication of such defamations of both races is profitable.

In reasoning on this point of the education of the black man and its results, it is needful neither to affirm nor contradict the statement further than to say that those who make disgraceful threats of exterminating eight million of people, assuming them all to be criminals, have probably fallen into the pernicious habit of generalizing in other directions. If the white people of America dislike above all things an educated negro, then the negroes should take courage and get all the education possible as soon as may be. Fear is at the base of all dislike and intolerance. The illiterate laborers among the blacks show, of course, few or no signs of possessing qualities either mental or spiritual which need make any white man fear for white supremacy. Hence, *they* are to be tolerated until the day of deportation, *or extermination.* But the educated! ah, there's the rub! Some educated negroes have this day achieved such standing in the world that their manhood is acknowledged gladly by earth's greatest and best, and the question of equality is never raised in their presence. The black race is yet in its infancy, for not until freedom supplies the first breath can any race be said to be born. What a few members of this newly emerged race have done for themselves and their race, others coming after them may in even greater measure achieve. The need of this, as of all undeveloped races, is unity of action and a *leader.* The capable leader inspired by a *selfless* devotion to the welfare of his people has yet to arise among the negroes. But those who cannot tolerate an educated negro foresee his day and hour, and fear his advent. *He will not advocate deportation.*

For in these days of rapid transit Africa is too near our doors to furnish any permanent exclusive asylum for any race. The earth is speedily becoming one great home of an interdependent humanity, and among human beings must be included the American negro. Numbers of those who talk and believe in his extermination have persuaded themselves that he is not human. Let the race be judged by the conduct of the majority of its members, as any other race is judged. The future holds not segregation of any race, but instead uplift for each and all by daily contact of life under more just conditions.

But miscegenation! For of course the threateners and defamers must have some catch-word to alarm white people to their assistance; and, indeed, this seems to answer their purpose, even though this word has been in use a long time and so few people believe in it (now that it has been limited to mean intermarriage of black and white), that one might safely and justly pass it by without further notice. But let us give all possible weight to this objection, supposing it to be honestly put forward. We must then answer whether the slaughter of eight million of people would be justified in order to prevent intermarriage of black and white. We deny that such a result is inevitable if the races remain in the same country. It is not even probable. Unhesitatingly we answer that *nothing* would or could justify the entertaining of so barbarous a proposition as extermination — much less its being put into practice.

Moreover, marriage is a question of individual relations, and Nature can safely be left to say the final word as to what is to continue and what become extinct. Certain it is, that that race which deliberately contemplates the annihilation of eight million human beings in order to keep its own blood pure, lacks self-restraint in many directions. But generalizations are as unjust here as elsewhere. The white race, as a race, nor even the majority of the race, has not for one instant seriously entertained the proposition to deal harshly with the negroes. The race prejudice already excited is bearing its legitimate fruit; life is neither so safe nor so comfortable in the South as before threats were made, and soon those who made the threats and stirred up the race-antagonisms will be properly rebuked by that vast majority of our own race who, in the long run, desire justice to prevail in all cases, and who therefore may be relied upon to recover from the illusions created by skillfully framed alarming sentences, even though uttered by honored and favored sons of this or that section. The blood of no race is in danger of contamination save from its own lusts; and deportation of every negro to-morrow to the heart of central Africa would be no protection, were self-restraint lacking.

These points are presented at this time for consideration by the peace-loving people of the world because of the certainty that unless a strong protest against these daily repeated threats of extermination be made, a race-conflict of unparalleled magnitude and indescribable horrors will result, and that within the lifetime of voters now living. And though this result might suit the purposes, and certainly could accomplish the ends, of the passionate upholders of white-supremacy, it is not conceivable that right-thinking men of either race desire the conflict. Those, therefore, who stand for peace must be outspoken in denunciation of every threat of extermination or any resort to force in this matter of deportation, and should be even more persistent and positive than are the propagandists of the slaughter idea. Rapes occur, but the race is not guilty of them. Let the guilty individual be dealt with by the law according to law. Every law-abiding citizen, of whatever race, must denounce by voice and pen any resort to mob violence, otherwise, at any moment, the advocates of extermination may precipitate upon the nation the race-war necessary for their infamous purpose. Public sentiment being thus crystallized against acts of violence, we may prevail and avert what now seems imminent. In this way, and in this way only, can our own hands be clean of blood-guilt in this issue between the races. We have no right to expect that black men shall rest easy under words which include all of them in incurable incompetence and crime, and which threaten all of them *untried* with extermination.

AT THE LIVE-OAKS,
TURNERSVILLE, TEXAS.

THE ANGEL OF PEACE, the monthly paper for children, which has been published for many years by the American Peace Society, has for the present been discontinued.

Calls to Christian Service.

In the Interests of the World's Peace.

BY RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN.
Author of "World Organization," etc.

Permanent peace for the world is more than ever in the minds and hearts of men. Our own experience in the Philippines, the horrors of England's war upon the Boers and the wholesale slaughters at Port Arthur and on the vast battlefields of Manchuria have filled the minds of many, many people with the conviction that some better way must be found whereby men can live together on earth. Action is demanded, for we have had sufficient agitation and preaching. Enough converts have been made to render it possible to do something.

Those of us who believe that the time is ripe for a forward movement can learn how to proceed with promise of success if we see how society has advanced beyond the stage in which every injured person was his own avenger. When courts were established so that the state and not the individual citizen defended private rights, then there was no longer any excuse for the carrying of arms by private persons, and the function of avenger passed from the private person to the state as a whole.

In order, therefore, to secure the peace of the world, in order to establish such international conditions that the rights of each nation will be defended, it is necessary to have some tribunal for the protection of national rights; that is, there must be a world-court. Such a court, firmly established in the practice of nations, will render war obsolete, because there will be no occasion for resort to force in order to secure national rights. This presumes that the world, as a whole, has advanced beyond the stage of plunder of one nation by another for the avowed sake of plunder. Whatever exceptions might be cited by a cynic, yet it is a fair judgment that the controlling nations of the world are to-day well advanced beyond the stage of mere piracy.

Our own country gives the best possible example of what the organization of the nations will be when the entire body of mankind is organized into one political body, as it surely will be. State sovereignty is recognized formally by the constitution of the United States in every respect in which specific surrender of sovereignty has not been made to the United States. But certain things have been surrendered. Over the nation broods the power of the Supreme Court, having jurisdiction of cases between States, and in other details. This jurisdiction is a complete preventive of wars between our sovereign States. Whenever and wherever the rights of any State are threatened, it has recourse to the Supreme Court of the United States. Every State, and every citizen of every State, has absolute confidence in the purpose of the Supreme Court of the United States to do full justice to every State and to every person within its jurisdiction. Method is provided for securing justice under forms of law and peace. Armed conflict is impossible.

Precisely so it will be when there shall be developed a supreme court of the world. Good reason might be shown for believing that the Hague Court of Arbitration will develop into such a world court. Something far more comprehensive than arbitration of international

differences will doubtless be evolved as the needs of the nations demand something higher and better. World evolution will by no means stop with such an incomplete beginning of a court as the present Hague Court of Arbitration, grand though that be as an improvement upon the past and as a promise for the future.

But a world court presupposes a world legislative body and hence come the timeliness, reasonableness and strength of the movement for the creation of a world legislature which appeared in the Massachusetts Legislature in 1902, and is now advancing in the estimation of thinkers at home and abroad. The international congresses and conferences of an official political nature which have already occurred, over thirty of them in all, down to and including the Peace Conference at The Hague in 1899 which established the Hague Court of Arbitration, are illustrations, in a measure, of world legislative bodies, for they represented the world, more or less, according to the number of nations concerned, and they formulated a judgment which, when ratified by their respective home governments, became a formal expression of the will of the world; and this is true world legislation. Best of all illustrations is that of the Universal Postal Union, for that includes every nation on the face of the earth with an organized government. In this sense the world legislature has already arrived in human affairs. Germs of the world executive have already begun to appear, sure to develop as the formal organization of the world into one body politic, after the essential manner of our United States, proceeds.

It is for the people of the United States, who are familiar with this form of government, while other nations of the world are without experience in it, to do all they can to promote the present effort to secure world organization as a single political body. It is certainly the quickest and surest way of securing the peace of the world. Not only will it forever establish world peace, with no more dangers from quarrels between nations than we now have dangers of quarrels between our States, but it will secure far more than the peace of the world. Peace being secured, with world organization, that organization will, of itself, develop to secure prosperity far beyond what we enjoy at present. Then every part of the world will be working in harmony. Nations will work together for the development of the resources of the earth. The continents will yield their treasure. The invention of man will be stimulated to its best. Travel to the ends of the earth will be easy. Riches peculiar to each will be shared with all by exchange of commodities until every land will enjoy what every other land can give for the improvement of the physical, mental and spiritual life. The world, no matter how many thousand years since man appeared, as the geologists tell us, is still in its infancy, because its fragments have not yet reached even the stage of organization into one whole. When mankind is organized, then its existence as unity will begin, and what it will accomplish working together will surely far outrun everything accomplished in the past when mankind consisted of warring fragments, trying to destroy, or at least to cripple, each other.

Fundamental in this movement for world organization lies the truth that mankind is really a unity to-day. Every great nation, by its statesmen and rulers, denies it. Every nation insists upon its own attribute of absolute national sovereignty. But the claim to absolute national sovereignty, though conceded by all who are in power, is a false claim. Truth and fact are higher than any human claim. Man's brotherhood is a truth. The existence of different nations on earth is a fact, and that fact of existence imposes upon every nation conditions, outside of itself, which are of the highest importance to itself, and whose existence is beyond its power to destroy. Therefore, in the very nature of the case, absolute national sovereignty is ridiculous. But the claim to absolute national sovereignty is to-day the most serious obstacle to the organization of the world into one political body.

This indicates the line of service for all who call themselves by the name of Christian. One of the root ideas in Christian service is the brotherhood of man. That very idea is at the bottom of the movement for world organization. Christianity and world politics, therefore, have, in their very nature, the closest relation. Patriotism which is the love of one's own country to the exclusion of due regard for one's brothers in any and every other country, is too narrow for true Christianity. Patriotism which does not grow upward till it develops into worldism is not true patriotism, for the highest good of any country is to be in its right organic relation with all the remainder of mankind. True Christianity seeks the good of brothers in one part of the world as truly as in any other part, and therefore the true Christian should be a world politician.

Practical work, then, for Christianity and for world politics lies at present in promoting, intelligently and persistently, the movement for the organization of the world into one body politic. The practical form of the movement now is taking shape in support of the call by the Czar for a second Peace Conference at The Hague. President Roosevelt, in the fall of 1905, acting through Secretary John Hay, called that Conference, and in the invitation Secretary Hay incorporated the resolution adopted by the Interparliamentary Union at its meeting in St. Louis in September, 1904, and presented to President Roosevelt by the official deputation of the Union. In response to a request from the Czar last summer, made through Ambassador Rosen, President Roosevelt has waived his invitation to a second Peace Conference in order that the Czar, who called the first Peace Conference, might call the second. Therefore it cannot be known at present whether the subjects named by Secretary Hay will be included in the program to be presented by the Czar. Most important of all those subjects was that of establishing a regular international congress, which is the proposed beginning for a regular world legislative body. This subject should not be dropped. If there is a strong public demand from this country, doubtless it will be considered, and it is possible that the second Peace Conference, which will be itself a sort of world legislative body, like its predecessors, will recommend that a third conference be called. Out of this it is easy to forecast the genuine development of a world legislature. Here, then, citizens of the United States, especially all who believe in the unity of mankind and the brotherhood of the race, have their present opportunity for practical effort.

Boston, Mass.

New Books.

AMERICAN DIPLOMACY, ITS SPIRIT AND ACHIEVEMENTS. By John Bassett Moore, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers.

American diplomacy presents a most attractive field for students of international law. Professor Moore, who on the whole is our greatest authority in this field, presents us in this book the fruits of many years of careful study and thought upon the character of our relations with other countries since the founding of the Republic. The book is both a history and an interpretation, more especially the latter, as he declares in the prefatory note that his object is primarily to give an exposition of the principles by which our international transactions have been guided. Chapter I. treats of the "Beginnings" of our diplomacy, and contains brief, interesting accounts of the difficult work abroad of Silas Deane, Franklin, Arthur Lee, John Jay, William Carmichael, Francis Dana, Henry Laurens, John Adams and others, during the Revolutionary period. Every line of this chapter is interesting reading to one who wishes to know the early history of the nation in its dealings with other countries. Chapter II. treats of the system of neutrality which our government early adopted, and has since maintained and endeavored to enlarge and perfect. Chapter III. is a lucid treatment of the principle of the "Freedom of the Seas," in the attainment of which the action of the United States did so much. Then follow chapters on the "Fisheries Questions," "The Contest with Commercial Restrictions," "Non-Intervention and the Monroe Doctrine," "The Doctrine of Expatriation," "International Arbitration," and "The Territorial Expansion of the United States." The chapter on arbitration is a fine presentation of the part which our government has taken in the great movement for the avoidance of war by the pacific judicial settlement of controversies with other countries. Professor Moore declares that "nothing could be more erroneous than the supposition," which has so often and so parrot-like been put forth in the last six or seven years, "that the United States has, as the result of certain changes in its habits, suddenly become, within the past few years, a world-power." "The United States has," he says, "in reality always been, in the fullest and highest sense, a world-power; and the record of its achievements in the promulgation and spread of liberal and human doctrines is one in which no American need hesitate to own a patriotic pride." We cordially recommend the book, without of course giving our approval to every statement in it, to all who wish to acquaint themselves, without too much time and labor, with the spirit and accomplishments of American diplomacy.

GARRISON THE NON-RESISTANT. By Ernest Crosby. Chicago: The Public Publishing Company. 141 pages. Price, 50 cts.

To those who may not have the time to read the monumental four-volume Life of William Lloyd Garrison by his sons, this little work will serve an admirable purpose. The author has succeeded remarkably in packing into a small compass the substance of the life and work of the great anti-slavery leader, and has made his book as fascinating as a piece of high-class fiction.

Mr. Crosby has brought into bold relief Garrison's peace principles, which were if possible more fundamental and radical than his anti-slavery views. During the centennial celebrations of Garrison's birth last month so much attention was given to his work as an anti-slavery reformer that his views on war were nearly forgotten. The revival of them by Mr. Crosby is therefore most opportune. In the chapters on Garrison and the Civil War and the Results of the War in the South, Mr. Crosby supports in a very strong and interesting way the contention, now made by an increasing number of people, that the war was a serious and disastrous mistake, as shown by the subsequent conditions in the South, and that Garrison's opposition to violence, if it could have prevailed, would have saved both the country and the negro race many of the grave ills which the war, with its brutality and hatreds, entailed.

Form of Bequest.

I hereby give and bequeath to the American Peace Society, Boston, a corporation established under the laws of the State of Massachusetts, the sum of ——— dollars, to be employed by the Directors of said Society for the promotion of the cause of peace.

Auxiliaries of the American Peace Society.

THE CHICAGO PEACE SOCIETY,
175 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

H. W. Thomas, D. D., President.
Mrs. E. A. W. Hoswell, Secretary.

THE MINNESOTA PEACE SOCIETY,
Minneapolis, Minn.

R. J. Mendenhall, President.
Miss A. B. Albertson, Secretary.

THE KANSAS STATE PEACE SOCIETY,
Wichita, Kansas.

George W. Hoss, LL. D., President.
Orman Emery, Secretary.

NEW YORK GERMAN-AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.
New York, N. Y.

Dr. Ernst Richard, President,
5 West 63d Street.
Gustav J. Voss, Secretary, 221 East 87th St.
Henry Feldman, Treasurer, 103 Second Ave.

THE ARBITRATION AND PEACE SOCIETY OF CINCINNATI.
First National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio

William Christie Herron, President,
Lindall R. Meyers, Secretary.

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

PRESIDENT.

HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, 6 Joy St., Boston, Mass.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY:

BENJ. F. TRUEBLOOD, LL.D., 31 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

TREASURER:

THOMAS H. RUSSELL, 27 State St., Boston, Mass.

AUDITOR:

DR. WILLIAM F. JARVIS, 233 Moody St., Waltham, Mass.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

Rev. Edw. Everett Hale, D.D., 39 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Charles G. Ames, D.D., 12 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
George T. Angell, 19 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.
Joshua L. Baily, 1624 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey, Winthrop Centre, Me.
Rev. Wm. E. Barton, D.D., Oak Park, Ill.
Hon. William I. Buchanan, Buffalo, N. Y.
Rev. Everett D. Burr, D.D., Newton Centre, Mass.
Prof. Geo. N. Boardman, Pittsford, Vt.
Hon. Samuel B. Capen, 38 Greenough Ave., Boston, Mass.
Hon. Jonathan Chace, Providence, R. I.
Rev. Frank G. Clark, Wellesley, Mass.
Edward H. Clement, 3 Regent Circle, Brookline, Mass.
Rev. Joseph S. Cogswell, Windham, Vt.
Rev. D. S. Coles, Wakefield, Mass.
Geo. Cromwell, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H.
Rev. Howard C. Dunham, Winthrop, Mass.
Everett O. Fisk, 4 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.
B. O. Flower, Brookline, Mass.
Hon. John B. Foster, Bangor, Me.
Merrill E. Gates, LL.D., Washington, D. C.
Edwin Ginn, 29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Maria Freeman Gray, 3674 22d St., San Francisco, Cal.
Rev. Scott F. Hershey, LL.D., Wooster, Ohio.
Bishop E. E. Hoss, D. D., Citra, Fla.
George W. Hoss, LL. D., Wichita, Kansas.
Julia Ward Howe, 241 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Hon. John W. Hoyt, Washington, D. C.
Rev. W. G. Hubbard, Columbus, Ohio.
Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, New York City, N. Y.
Augustine Jones, Newton Highlands, Mass.
Hon. Sumner I. Kimball, Washington, D. C.
Bishop William Lawrence, Cambridge, Mass.
Edwin D. Mead, 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Philip S. Moxom, D.D., Springfield, Mass.
George Foster Peabody, 28 Monroe Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
L. H. Pillsbury, Derry, N. H.
Hon. J. H. Powell, Henderson, Ky.
Hon. Wm. L. Putnam, Portland Me.
Sylvester F. Scovel, D. D., Wooster, Ohio.
Mrs. May Wright Sewall, Indianapolis, Ind.
Edwin Burritt Smith, 164 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.
Mrs. Ruth H. Spray, Salida, Col.
Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, Portland, Me.
Rev. Edward M. Taylor, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.
Pres. M. Carey Thomas, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Rev. Reuen Thomas, D.D., Brookline, Mass.
Pres. C. F. Thwing, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio.
Pres. James Wallace, Ph. D., St. Paul, Minn.
Bishop Henry W. Warren, Denver, Col.
Booker T. Washington, LL. D., Tuskegee, Ala.
Kate Gannett Wells, 45 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Herbert Welsh, 1305 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. A. E. Winship, 29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Richard Wood, 1620 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.

DIRECTORS:

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, *ex-officio.*
Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D., *ex-officio.*
Alice Stone Blackwell, 45 Boutwell St., Dorchester, Mass.
Raymond L. Bridgman, Auburndale, Mass.
Frederick Brooks, 31 Milk St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. S. C. Bushnell, Arlington, Mass.
Frederic Cunningham, 53 State St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Miss Anna B. Eckstein, 30 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass.
Rev. B. F. Leavitt, Belmont, Mass.
Lucia Ames Mead, 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Wm. A. Mowry, Ph.D., Hyde Park, Mass.
Bliss Perry, 4 Park St., Boston, Mass.
Henry Pickering, 81 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
Frederick A. Smith, West Medford, Mass.
Homer B. Sprague, Ph. D., Newton, Mass.
Rev. G. W. Stearns, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Fiske Warren, 8 Mt. Vernon Place, Boston, Mass.
Rev. C. H. Watson, D.D., Arlington, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, *ex-officio.*
Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D., *ex-officio.*
Frederick Brooks, 31 Milk St., Boston, Mass.
Frederic Cunningham, 53 State St., Boston, Mass.
Wm. A. Mowry, Ph. D., Hyde Park, Mass.
Henry Pickering, 81 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Dr. Homer B. Sprague, Newton, Mass.

HONORARY COUNSEL:

Cephas Brainerd, New York, N.Y.
Moorfield Storey, Brookline, Mass.
Judge William L. Putnam, Portland, Me.
Hon. Josiah Quincy, Boston, Mass.

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be designated the "AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY."

ART. II. This Society, being founded on the principle that war is contrary to the spirit of Christianity and of all true religion and morality, shall have for its object to illustrate the inconsistency of war with this spirit, to show its baleful influence on all the great interests of mankind, and to devise means for insuring universal and permanent peace.

ART. III. All persons desirous of promoting peace on earth and goodwill towards men may become members of this society.

ART. IV. Every annual member of the Society shall pay a yearly contribution of two dollars; the payment of twenty-five dollars at one time shall constitute any person a Life member.

ART. V. The chairman of each corresponding committee, the officers and delegates of every auxiliary contributing to the funds of this Society and every minister of the gospel who preaches once a year on the subject of peace, and takes up a collection in behalf of the cause, shall be entitled to the privileges of regular members.

ART. VI. All contributors shall be entitled within the year to one-half the amount of their contributions in the publications of the Society.

ART. VII. The Officers of this Society shall be a President, Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer, an Auditor and a Board of Directors, consisting of not more than twenty members of the Society, including the President, Secretary and Treasurer, who shall be ex-officio members of the Board. All Officers shall hold their offices until their successors are appointed, and the Board of Directors shall have power to fill vacancies in any office of the Society. There shall be an Executive Committee of seven, consisting of the President, Secretary and five Directors to be chosen by the Board, which Committee shall, subject to the Board of Directors, have the entire control of the executive and financial affairs of the Society. Meetings of the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee may be called by the President, the Secretary, or two members of such body. The Society or the Board of Directors may invite persons of well-known legal ability to act as Honorary Counsel.

ART. VIII. The Society shall hold an annual meeting at such time and place as the Board of Directors may appoint, to receive their own and the Treasurer's report, to choose officers, and transact such other business as may come before them.

ART. IX. The object of this Society shall never be changed; but the Constitution may in other respects be altered, on recommendation of the Executive Committee, or of any ten members of the Society, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at any regular meeting.

Publications of the American Peace Society.

Tolstoy's Letter on the Russo-Japanese War.—48 pages and cover. Price, postpaid, 10 cts.

A Regular International Advisory Congress. — By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. A paper read before the Twenty-first Conference of the International Law Association, Antwerp, Belgium, September 30, 1903. Price 5 cts. each,

War Unnecessary and Unchristian.—By Augustine Jones, LL. B. New edition, 20 pages. 5 cts. each, $2.00 per hundred.

Nationalism and Internationalism, or Mankind One Body.—By George Dana Boardman, D.D., LL.D. New edition. Price 5 cts. each, or $2.00 per hundred, prepaid.

The Hague Court in the Pious Fund Arbitration. — Address of Hon. William L. Penfield, Solicitor of the State Department, at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, May 28, 1903. Price 5 cts. each.

The Historic Development of the Peace Idea.— By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D. New edition, revised. 24 pages. Price 5 cts. each. $2.50 per hundred.

Passive Resistance — Jesus' Method of Government. — By Algernon S. Crapsey. 12 pages and cover. 5 cts. each; $3.00 per hundred, net.

A Primer of the Peace Movement. — Prepared by Lucia Ames Mead. A reprint of the American Peace Society's Card-display Exhibit at the St. Louis Exposition. A most valuable compendium of statistics, brief arguments, facts, etc. 26 pages, large print. Price 10 cts.; $7.50 per hundred.

A Solemn Review of the Custom of War. — By Noah Worcester, D. D. A reprint of the pamphlet first published in 1814. 24 pages. Price 5 cts.; $3 per hundred.

Dymond's Essay on War. — With an introduction by John Bright. Sent free on receipt of 5 cts. for postage.

War from the Christian Point of View.— By Ernest Howard Crosby. Revised edition. $1.50 per hundred, prepaid.

Women and War. — By Grace Isabel Colbron. 4 pages. 40 cts. per hundred, postpaid.

A French Plea for Limitation of Armaments. — By Baron d'Estournelles de Constant. Address delivered in the French Senate. 28 pages. Price 5 cts. $3.00 per hundred.

The Mexican International American Conference and Arbitration. — By Hon William I. Buchanan. Address delivered before the American Peace Society, Boston, April 15, 1902. 23 pages. Price 5 cts., prepaid.

The Absurdities of Militarism.— By Ernest Howard Crosby. 12 pages. Price $1.50 per hundred. Third edition.

An Essay toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe.— By William Penn. First published in 1693. 24 pages, with cover. Price 6 cts., or $3.00 per hundred, prepaid.

International Arbitration at the Opening of the Twentieth Century.—By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. 20 pages. Price 5 cts. each. $2.50 per hundred, postpaid.

Perpetual Peace. — By Immanuel Kant. Translated by Benjamin F. Trueblood. 53 pages. Price 20 cents, postpaid.

The Arbitrations of the United States. — By Professor John Bassett Moore. 32 pages. 5 cents each. $2.50 per hundred.

The War System: Its History, Tendency, and Character, in the Light of Civilization and Religion. — By Rev. Reuen Thomas, D.D. New edition. Price 10 cts., prepaid.

Report of the Chicago Peace Congress of 1893. — Price postpaid, cloth 75 cts.; paper, 50 cents.

Report of the American Friends' Peace Conference. — Held at Philadelphia in December, 1901. Contains all the papers read. Price 15 cts. postpaid.

The Christian Attitude Toward War in the Light of Recent History.— By Alexander Mackennal, D. D. Address delivered at the International Congregational Council, Boston, September 22, 1899. Price $1.50 per hundred, prepaid.

Military Drill in Schools. — By Rev. W. Evans Darby, LL.D. 8 pages. Price 2 cts., or $1.25 per hundred, postpaid.

William Penn's Holy Experiment in Civil Government. — By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. 24 pages with cover. 5 cts. each, or $2.00 per hundred, carriage paid.

History of the Seventy-five Years' Work of the American Peace Society. — 16 pages. Two copies for 5 cts.

A Battle, as it appeared to an Eye-witness. — By Rev. R. B. Howard. Letter Leaflet No. 1. Price, postpaid, 20 cts. per hundred.

The Cherry Festival of Naumburg. — Letter Leaflet No. 4. Price 20 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Washington's Anti-militarism. — Letter Leaflet No. 48. pages. Price 35 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Coals of Fire. — By Willis R. Hotchkiss, of the Friends' African Industrial Mission. Letter Leaflet No. 7. Price 30 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

The Christ of the Andes. — 8 pages. Illustrated. $1.00 per hundred, postpaid.

The publication of the ANGEL OF PEACE, notice of which has heretofore stood in this space, has been discontinued for the present.

The Woman's Journal.

The Woman's Journal, edited weekly at 3 Park Street, Boston, Mass., by Henry B. Blackwell and Alice Stone Blackwell, gives the news of the movement for equal rights for women all over the world. $1.50 per year. Trial subscription, 3 months, 25 cents.

"It is the best source of information concerning what women are doing, what they have done, and what they should do."
—*Julia Ward Howe.*

The Advocate of Peace

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE MOVEMENT.

Price, One Dollar a Year. In Clubs of ten or more, 50 Cents a Year.

PUBLISHED BY

The American Peace Society,

31 Beacon Street, Boston.

PEACE PUBLICATIONS

FOR SALE BY THE

American Peace Society.

Prices Include Postage.

LAY DOWN YOUR ARMS. By The Baroness von Suttner. Authorized English translation by T. Holmes. New edition, cloth, 65 cts.

SUMNER'S ADDRESSES ON WAR. THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS, THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS, and THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY: The three in one volume. Price, 65 cts., postpaid.

THE PEACE CONFERENCE AT THE HAGUE. By Frederick W. Holls, Secretary of the American Commission to the Hague Conference. 572 pages, octavo. Price, $2.50, postpaid.

CHANNING'S DISCOURSES ON WAR. Containing Dr. Channing's Addresses on War, with extracts from discourses and letters on the subject. Price, 65 cts. postpaid.

ARBITRATION AND THE HAGUE COURT. By Hon. John W. Foster. A concise manual of the chief features of the arbitration movement at the present time. Prepared at the request of the Mohonk Arbitration Conference. Price postpaid, $1.00.

INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS: A collection of the Schemes which have been proposed. Adds a long list of instances of international settlements by arbitral courts and commissions. By W. Evans Darby, LL.D. Fourth Edition, much enlarged. Cloth, over 900 pages. Price, $3.50, postpaid.

THE FUTURE OF WAR. By John de Bloch. Preface by W. T. Stead. The sixth volume of Mr. Bloch's great work on "The Future of War," containing all his propositions, summaries of arguments, and conclusions. Price, postpaid, 65 cts.

THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD. By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. A discussion of the grounds, both theoretic and historic, for believing in the Realization of the Brotherhood of Humanity, and the final organization of the World into an International State. Second Edition. Cloth, 169 pages. Price, 65 cts.

THE BLOOD OF THE NATION. By David Starr Jordan. Cloth. Price, 40 cts.

TOLSTOY AND HIS MESSAGE. By Ernest Howard Crosby. Cloth. Price, 50 cts.

TOLSTOY AS A SCHOOLMASTER. By Ernest Howard Crosby. Cloth. Price, 50 cts.

WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. By David L. Dodge. A reprint of the first two pamphlets published in this Country in the Interests of Peace. Price, 65 cts.

WORLD ORGANIZATION. By Raymond L. Bridgman. Price, 65 cts.

Official Report

OF THE

Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress

HELD AT

Boston, October 3-8, 1904

A book of 350 pages, paper covers
Contains all the papers, addresses, and discussions of the Congress

A most valuable document for all peace workers and students of the cause

May be procured at the office of the

American Peace Society
31 Beacon Street, Boston

The only charge is 10 cts., to cover postage and wrapping

60 YEARS' EXPERIENCE

PATENTS

TRADE MARKS
DESIGNS
COPYRIGHTS &C.

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. HANDBOOK on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents.
Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive *special notice*, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, $3 a year; four months, $1. Sold by all newsdealers

MUNN & Co. 361 Broadway, **New York**
Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.